DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 434 468 EC 307 466

AUTHOR Parrish, Thomas; Kaleba, Daniel; Gerber, Michael; McLaughlin, Margaret

TITLE Special Education: Study of Incidence of Disabilities. Final Report.
INSTITUTION American Institutes for Research, Washington, DC.
SPONS AGENCY California State Legislative Analyst's Office, Sacramento.; California State Dept. of Finance, Sacramento.; California State Dept. of Education, Sacramento.
PUB DATE 1998-09-30
NOTE 135p.
AVAILABLE FROM For full text: <http://www.lao.ca.gov/>.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Finance; Elementary Secondary Education; *Financial Support; Incidence; *Severe Disabilities; *Special Education; State Programs; State Regulation; State School District Relationship
IDENTIFIERS *California; *Disproportionate Representation (Spec Educ)

ABSTRACT

This final report discusses the findings of a study that investigated the extent to which severe and/or high cost disabilities are evenly or unevenly distributed among the population of special education local plan areas (SELPAs) in California, and if the population-based special education funding formula should be adjusted. Results of the study found that severe and/or high cost students are not randomly distributed throughout the state. As the basis for adjusting the funding formula accordingly, a "severity service multiplier" was created for each SELPA based on the characteristics and services received by special education students residing in their attendance areas. This index indicates SELPAs with responsibilities for disproportionate numbers of severe and/or high cost students. Supplemental funding allowances were calculated for some SELPAs based on their severity service multiplier in relation to the state average, their overall average daily attendance funded rate, their total average daily attendance count, and other factors. Based on this analysis, it is estimated that the cost of fully implementing the severity service multiplier in the first year would be approximately $57 million. This cost estimate would represent supplemental state special education funding in the first year of about 1.5 percent. (Contains 18 references and 22 appendixes of research data.) (CR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 434 468

Special Education: Study of Incidence of Disabilities

Final Report

Thomas Parrish, Project Director
Daniel Kaleba
Michael Gerber
Margaret McLaughlin

September 30, 1998

Submitted to:
Office of the Legislative Analyst
925 L Street, Suite 1000
Sacramento, CA 95814

California Department of Education
Special Education Division
515 L Street, Suite 270
Sacramento, CA 95814

California Department of Finance
915 L Street, 7th Floor
Sacramento, CA 95814

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Kaleba
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

EC 307466

Table of Contents

List of Tables iii
Acknowledgments iv
Abstract vi

Chapter 1. Introduction 1
Objectives 1
General Approach 3
Severity Analysis 3
SELPA-Level Interviews 3
Analysis of High Cost Students Based on Services Received 3
Severity Service Adjustment 4
Defining Severe and/or High Cost Students 4
Summary of Findings 5
Overview of Remainder of Report 6

Chapter 2. Overview of California Special Education Funding 8
California Master Plan for Special Education 8
California Assembly Bill 602 Funding Formula 9
Legislative Directive 9
Description of AB 602 Funding Formula 9
AB 602 is a Population-Based Funding Approach 11
An Unresolved Issue Regarding AB 602 Funding Systems 11

Chapter 3. Severity Analysis 13
Origins of analyses 13
Concepts and Terminology 14
Sources of Variability 15
Statistical Meaning of Variability 16
Testing Statistical Significance of Variability 17
Modeling Severity 17
Low Incidence Category Model 17
The High Cost Student Model 19
Rank Order Differences Across SELPAs 20
Summary 21

Chapter 4. Factors Associated with Variability and Severe Service Intensities 23
Consistency of Classification 23

The Role of Ethnicity, Language, and Social Class 24
California Analysis of Incidence of Disabilities 25
Conceptual Framework and Variables 25
Data Sources 26
Measures 26
Analytical Strategy 28
Stepwise Regressions 30
Subgroup Analysis 32
Summary and Conclusions 33

Chapter 5. Interviews with SELPA directors 35
Knowledge of Rankings 36
Patterns in Incidence 36
Cost Factors 38
Reducing Costs 42

Chapter 6. Development and Specification of Service Model 43

Chapter 7. Severity Service Adjustment 51
Steps to Calculate Incidence Multiplier 51
Most Fair, Feasible, and Appropriate 55

References 65

Appendix

List of Tables

Table 1-1. California Cost Estimates and Incidence Rates vs. U.S. Average Estimates 5
Table 3-1. Summary of CHI-SQUARE Analyses Testing Significance of Differences of Incidence Rates for Severely Disabled Children 19
Table 3-2 . Summary of CHI-SQUARE Analyses Testing Significance of Differences of Incidence Rates for Severely Disabled 20
Table 3-3. Summary of RANK ORDER CORRELATION Analyses Testing Differences of SELPA Ranks Based Using Different Models of Severe Disability 21
Table 4-1. Variables, measures, and their interpretations 29
Table 4-2. Zero order correlations and probabilities (in italics)for eleven independent and two dependent measures 31
Table 5-1. Changes in Autism and Severe Emotional Disturbance Enrollments (Ages 6-21) 1990/91 - 1995/96 37
Table 5-2. Race/Ethnicity and Gender of Students in California Public Schools, in Public Special Education Programs, NPSs, and NPSs/LCIs 40
Table 6-1. Estimated State Average Unit Cost by Placement and Related Service 44
Table 6-2. Sample of Students 1-5 and Unique Service Cost Estimates 47
Table 6-3. Sample of Students 6-8 and Unique Service Cost Estimates 49
Table 7-1. Severity Service Adjustment 57

Acknowledgments

The AIR research team would like to thank the following professionals who contributed generously their time and effort to the Study of Incidence of Disabilities and the preparation of this final report:

- Project Monitor, Stuart Marshall of the Legislative Analysts Office, Mary Hudler of the California Department of Education, and Jeff Bell of the California Department of Finance.

- Advisory Committee members including Edward Del Castillo, Dave Gross, Sarge Kennedy, Jack Lucas, Debra Owens, and Mark Shrager. The Advisory Committee provided guidance and feedback throughout the study to the research team. The Committee was comprised of three SELPA directors, two budget supervisors, and one principal. Some of the members of the Committee were also parents of children with disabilities. Six working meetings were conducted with the advisory committee over the approximate six month duration of the study. Several conference calls were conducted in the final months to review and revise the severity service adjustment analysis. The Advisory Committee members were especially helpful in advising the research team with the specifications of the various extant databases, providing feedback to the service model, and in developing the severity service adjustment.

- Interview respondents who took the time to participate in our telephone surveys, including the directors from the following SELPAs:

  Downey-Montebello
  East San Gabriel Valley
  East Valley
  Elk Grove
  Garden Grove
  Greater Anaheim
  Irvine Unified School District
  Kern Union High
  Los Angeles Unified School District
  Modoc
  North Orange County
  Oakland
  San Diego
  San Francisco
  South Orange County
  Southwest
  Whittier

- Members of the California Department of Education including Barbara McDonald, Judy Johnson, Deborah Freitag, Larry Huiga, and Gayle Eggleston, who provided us with the data and documentation needed for the study.

- Paul Goldfinger for his thoughtful consideration and advice.

Support staff at the American Institutes for Research who were instrumental to the completion of the study and the production of the final report, including Anna Williams, Bob Morris, Irene Lam, Stuart Grooby, Irene Lam, Molly Kiely, Heather Shaw, and Gina Chen.

Abstract

The Poochigian and Davis Special Education Reform Act of 1997 (Assembly Bill 602, Chapter 854, Statutes of 1997) changed California special education funding from a resource-based to a population-based model. As described in the California Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) newsletter for the Fall of 1997, it is "perhaps the most revolutionary legislative action in the history of California special education" (Kennedy, 1997, p. 20). However, it specified that further study was needed regarding variability in the incidence of disabilities across the state that are significantly above average cost and medically defined and/or severe.

There are two principal objectives to this study. The first is to determine the extent to which severe and/or high cost disabilities are evenly or unevenly distributed among the population of SELPAs. If it is determined that the incidence of these disabilities across SELPAs is uneven and non-random, then the research team is to recommend a method to adjust the AB 602 population-based funding formula accordingly.

The research team conducted four primary analyses to address these objectives. These were the severity analysis, SELPA-level interviews, the analysis of high cost students based on services received, and the development of the severity service adjustment. Also, critical to the successful completion of this study was the work and full participation of the project advisory committee. Members, Edward Del Castillo, Dave Gross, Sarge Kennedy, Jack Lucas, Debra Owens, and Mark Shrager provided guidance and feedback throughout the study.

The AB 602 funding formula is based on the total student enrolment of each SELPA, as opposed to the prior system which was based on funding units linked to the number of children identified for special education. According to the Bill, the new funding method:

> "ensures greater equity in funding among SELPAs, avoids unnecessary complexity, requires fiscal and program accountability, and avoids financial incentives to inappropriately place pupils in special education." (AB 602 Davis, p.2).

A potential problem associated with population-based systems, however, is that they appear to be based on the assumption of an equal prevalence of students requiring special education. That is, one possible rationale for having districts or states of the same size receive the same amount of special education funding is the assumption that incidence

rates for students with disabilities are approximately the same across jurisdictions. The purpose of this study is to test this assumption, and if found to be false, to recommend appropriate adjustments to the new AB 602 funding system.

We found that severe and/or high cost students are *not* randomly distributed throughout the state. These findings were consistent and clear, regardless of the definition of severity used. As the basis for adjusting the AB 602 funding formula accordingly, we created a "severity service multiplier" for each SELPA based on the characteristics and services received by special education students residing in their attendance areas. This index indicates SELPAs with responsibilities for disproportionate numbers of severe and/or high cost students. Supplemental funding allowances were calculated for some SELPAs based on their severity service multiplier in relation to the state average, their overall AB 602 average daily attendance (ADA) funded rate, their total ADA count, and other factors as described in Chapter 7.

Based on the analysis presented in this paper, we estimate the cost of fully implementing the severity service multiplier in the first year to be approximately $57 million. This cost estimate would represent supplemental state special education funding in the first year of about 1.5 percent.

Chapter 1

Introduction

The Poochigian and Davis Special Education Reform Act of 1997 (Assembly Bill 602, Chapter 854, Statutes of 1997) changed California special education funding from a resource-based to a population-based model. The new model distributes funds to special education local plan areas (SELPAs) on a fixed amount per student in average daily attendance (ADA) as opposed to the system determined by the California Master Plan for Special Education, which provided funding based on units of placement. The long term intention is to provide SELPAs with comparable ADAs comparable funds for special education services.

As described in the California Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) newsletter for the Fall of 1997, the passage of AB 602 is "perhaps the most revolutionary legislative action in the history of California special education" (Kennedy, 1997, p. 20). However, this landmark legislation clearly specified that further study is needed in two areas of public policy. The first set of issues, which is the subject of this report, relates to the question of variability in the incidence of disabilities across the state that are significantly above average in cost and medically defined and/or severe. The second set of issues relates to the state's nonpublic schools, and is addressed through a separate study, also conducted by AIR[1].

Objectives

There are two principal objectives to this study. The first objective is to determine the extent to which severe and/or high cost disabilities are evenly or unevenly distributed among the population of SELPAs. If it is determined that the incidence of these disabilities across SELPAs is uneven and non-random, then the research team is to recommend a method to adjust the AB 602 population-based funding formula accordingly to account for these observed differences.

Specifically, the RFP proposed the following five main questions The chapters that address each question are noted in parentheses:

[1]The NPS report "Special Education: Nonpublic School and Nonpublic Agency Study" was submitted to the California Legislative Analysts Office on September 30, 1998.

1. What are your working definitions of medically defined disabilities, significantly above-average in cost disabilities, and severe disabilities? What is your justification for selecting these definitions? How accurate and reliable are your data using working definitions? What are the strengths of your definitions? What are the weaknesses of your definitions? (Chapters 1 and 3)

2. What methodology did you use to analyze the data? (Chapters 3-7 and Appendix)

3. Was the variation in the incidence statistically significant? If so, are there other factors that mitigate the financial impact of any variation? Is the variation significant from a public policy perspective? To what extent are the identically categorized pupils identically labeled and served from SELPA to SELPA? To what extent does the reported incidence of disabilities data equate with the true incidence of disabilities? To what extent is the reported incidence of disabilities data reliable for use in an adjustment factor? (Chapter 3)

4. If an adjustment is called for, what do you propose as the most fair, feasible, and appropriate method to adjust California's population-based formula taking into consideration the need to avoid creating financial incentives or disincentives to inappropriately identify, place, and/or serve pupils? Justify selection of annual or one-time adjustments. (Chapter 7)

5. Is there another external measure which correlates with your findings that could be used as a proxy measure (for example, a measure not tied to LEA reporting) to identify pupils with the "disabilities under study." For example, the federal government plans to incorporate a poverty measure into its distribution formula. Discuss all of these alternatives that you considered, your justification for recommending a particular proxy measure, and your rationale for rejecting each alternative or all of the potential proxy measures. (Chapter 4)

This report presents the findings from the AB 602 legislative mandate to "study, analyze, and report on data that would indicate the extent to which the incidence of disabilities, that are medically defined or severe and significantly above-average in cost, or both, are evenly or unevenly distributed among the population of special education local plan areas" (AB 602, Sec. 67, a).

General Approach

The research team conducted four primary analyses to address the objectives of the study. These were the severity analysis, SELPA-level interviews, the analysis of high cost students based on services received, and the development of the severity service adjustment.

Severity Analysis

In this analysis, we approached the issue of variability by constructing and testing different models of severity. We began with a simple model using the six low incidence categories specified as "severe" by AB 602. In a second model, we added autism to the AB 602 definitions. Using these operational definitions, statistical tests were conducted to determine whether differences in the incidences of severe disabilities were greater than expected by chance. Chapter 3 provides a detailed description of this analysis.

SELPA-Level Interviews

Telephone interviews were conducted with 17 SELPA directors to gain an understanding of the factors underlying observed variability in overall special education identification rates, the proportion of students with low incidence and/or severe disabilities, and the factors contributing to high service costs for these students. Eight SELPAs were selected based on their rankings within the state on the proportion of students with low incidence of disabilities, and six others were selected based on their proportion of "high cost" students (as defined through the analysis described below). Three SELPAs were selected to examine why their overall special education identification rates were low in relation to their percentage of high cost students. Chapter 5 presents these SELPA directors' perspectives on varying incidence rates of high cost and/or severe students in SELPAs, why the incidence and cost of certain disabilities are increasing, and why students with similar disabilities sometimes receive different levels of service across the state, with intensity of service serving as a proxy measure for severity.

Analysis of High Cost Students Based on Services Received

The purpose of this analysis is to develop a uniform set of procedures for measuring variations in services received by students across the state. With help from the Advisory Committee, the research team constructed a model that compared the placement and related services of students to the special education personnel providing these services. This analysis is based primarily on data from the California

Special Education Management Information System (CASEMIS) and the Special Education Personnel Data Report. Chapter 6 and the Appendix describe the methodology and approach of this analysis in detail.

Severity Service Adjustment

This approach builds on the former three analyses to develop a severity service adjustment for SELPAs serving disproportionate numbers of high cost students. The simulation model determines a severity service multiplier for each SELPA and applies it to the AB 602 funded state average base rate. This value is then compared to the SELPA's current base rate to determine whether they qualify for supplemental severity funding. Chapter 7 describes in detail the specifics of the severity service adjustment.

Defining Severe and/or High Cost Students

A major challenge confronting this study is the relative ambiguity of the alternative criteria that could be used to operationalize concepts related to "severe and high cost" disabilities. For example, one criterion that some argue can be used to distinguish between severe and non-severe categories is medically versus non-medically related disabilities. However, *all* of the federally funded defined categories of disability have a *medical* definition. Further, the special education community recognizes severity as a *dimension* of disability, rather than a characteristic that is unambiguously tied to *specific* categories of disability. Prior research has shown the difficulty in attempting to draw strict relationships between special education cost and disability category. As an example, in reporting average costs by disability, Hartman (1983) found the degree of cost variability *within* each of these categories of disability to be much greater than the averages *across* categories. Some categories of disability that may not generally be considered severe, may for individual cases and sometimes on average, prove to be high cost.

The ambiguity of severity as a dimension of disability is formally accommodated in federal mandates (i.e., the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act), and conforming state legislation by specific processes and procedures that require individualized assessment and programming for students identified as disabled. This suggests that variability arises not from some random distribution of disabilities across live births, but rather from a host of non-randomly distributed environmental factors both within and external to schools.

A critical first step for this study was to derive working definitions for identifying "severe and/or high cost" special education students. Initially, we pursued analyses using separate "severe" and "high cost" definitions. In the final approach, which

serves as the basis for our funding recommendations, we combine the two concepts to derive a severity service adjustment for each SELPA.

Summary of Findings

We found that severe and/or high cost students are not randomly distributed throughout the state. These findings were consistent and clear, regardless of the definition of severity used (i.e., including varying combinations of disability conditions within the severe classification), or variations observed in the number of high cost students based on primary disability condition and services received (see Table 3-1, Chapter 3).

It was determined that counts of severe and/or high cost students could not be based on categories of disability alone due to the ambiguity of severity categories. As an example of the ambiguity of these categories, California's incidence by disability differs substantially from that found across the nation despite relatively clear federal definitions of these disability categories (see Table 1-1).

Table 1-1. California Cost Estimates and Incidence Rates vs. U.S. Average Estimates

Disability		Cost Estimates by Disability		Percent SE by Disability	
		Severe Service Model Averages	National Estimates (Moore et al.)*	California	Nation
Severe	MR	$11,164	$8,393	5.7%	11.6%
	HH	$13,128	$9,530	1.0%	1.3%
	DEAF	$20,575	**	0.6%	**
	VI	$19,252	$8,982	0.7%	0.5%
	DB	$32,323	$33,544	<0.1%	0.0%
	OI	$17,384	$9,225	2.2%	1.2%
	MH	$21,442	$12,844	1.1%	1.8%
	AUT	$18,037	$13,902	1.0%	0.5%
	TBI	$15,141	$33,500	0.1%	0.2%
Non-severe	SLD	$5,574	$4,865	55.7%	51.4%
	SLI	$2,659	$3,286	26.3%	20.6%
	SED	$17,579	$8,251	3.1%	8.6%
	OHI	$7,510	$9,751	<0.01%	2.2%

*data from 1985-86 adjusted to 1996-97 dollars
**Federal data combine the disability category of "deaf" with "hard of hearing"

While placing larger percentages of our special education students in the more generic disability categories of speech and learning disabled, California identified mentally retarded students at nearly half the national rate and severely emotionally disturbed at much less than half the national rate. As shown in Table 1-1, the findings from our analysis as well as from national cost studies, also show that high cost students do not line up well with the "severe disabilities" currently specified in AB 602.

Using the methods and definitions described below, we have created a severity service multiplier for each SELPA in the state based on the characteristics and services received by the special education students residing in their attendance areas. This allows us to identify SELPAs with responsibilities for disproportionate numbers of severe and/or high cost students. We recommend a supplemental funding allowance for SELPAs based on their severity service multiplier in relation to the state average, their overall AB 602 average daily attendance (ADA) funded rate, their total ADA count, and other factors as described in Chapter 7.

This multiplier could also assist the state to address concerns about greater uniformity in the identification of students for special education and the services received. As this approach clearly identifies SELPAs showing disproportionate numbers of severe and/or high cost students, in addition to providing supplemental support, the state may wish to target some of these SELPAs for greater scrutiny regarding local procedures for special education identification and assignment of services.

Based on the analysis presented in this paper, we estimate the cost of fully implementing the severity service multiplier in the first year to be approximately $57 million. Based on the overall cost estimate we derive for special education in California, this represents supplemental funding in the first year of about 1.5 percent.

Overview of Remainder of Report

This report is organized around the four types of analyses used to address the five main questions from the state's descriptions of work for this study. Chapter 2 provides an overview of California special education funding, including the Master Plan for Special Education and Assembly Bill 602. Chapter 3 addresses the severity analysis and investigates whether the incidence of severe and/or high cost disabilities is randomly distributed across SELPAs. Chapter 4 analyzes the factors associated with variability and severe service intensities of severe and/or high cost students across SELPAs. Chapter 5 presents information from the interviews with SELPA directors. Chapter 6 describes the development and specification of the special education service model and

analyzes high cost students based on services received. Chapter 7 provides information on the severity service adjustment. The Appendix provides further detail regarding the specifications of the severity analysis, service model approach, and the severity service adjustment.

Chapter 2

Overview of California Special Education Funding

California Master Plan for Special Education

The California Master Plan for Special Education (MP) was first proposed in 1974 as a method of unifying the diverse funds supporting the variety of special education programs found throughout the state. Prior to the MP, special education was funded primarily on an amount per child basis that was dependent upon disabling condition. Local districts and county boards had the option of levying taxes to supplement state funding. The MP replaced the previous system by changing the unit of analysis from disabling condition of student to an entitlement, or resource-based, model driven by placement units. The amount of funding districts received was primarily determined by the number of special day class (SDC), resource program (RSP), and designated instructional service (DIS) units of service provided.

Although the funding component of the MP was reasonable in its design as a cost-based unit funding system, over time it was seen as unduly complex and vastly inequitable. Perhaps the most notable criticism to the MP was its reliance on 1979-80 as a base year, which created large variations in unit rates across SELPAs. Major inequities within the MP arose from the fact that it reflected many of the idiosyncrasies of each district's reporting conventions during that year and that the formula was not well designed to reflect the many changes that occurred over time.

The MP was originally intended to provide funding for a sufficient number of funding units to serve 10 percent of the pupil population in special education programs across the state. After implementation, however, the MP proved much more costly than anticipated. As a result, expansion in the number of units districts were eligible to receive varied from year to year and was substantially curtailed in many years.

The complexity of the MP was an additional criticism. Critics objected to the time, effort, and expertise required to complete the entitlement forms, called the J-50. The instruction forms alone, prepared by the Education Finance Division, for completing the 1997-98 J-50 are 25 pages, single spaced. The electronic file itself includes 5450 lines of code, and more than 1000 input variables. A cottage industry has even emerged in the field to advise districts how to maximize their special education funding returns with the J-50. The authors of AB 602 even went as far to claim that "the process-intensive J-50 claim system

that drains local resources away from providing services to completing numerous, lengthy reports in order to secure state funding for special education" should be eliminated (Davis AB 602, p.9). Moreover, critics charged the MP and J-50 reporting system restricted local decision making and frustrated innovation, as well as include potentially inappropriate financial incentives.

Such complexities finally influenced the California Legislature to seriously consider a change in the MP special education funding model. In the fall of 1994, the Legislature commissioned the California Department of Education (CDE), the Department of Finance (CDF), and the Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO) to propose a new funding model. This report was an important precursor to the eventual passage of AB 602, which dramatically altered California's approach to funding special education.

California Assembly Bill 602 Funding Formula

Legislative Directive

The Poochigian and Davis Special Education Reform Act of 1997 established a new method for financing special education that is based on the total student enrolment of each SELPA. According to the Bill, it was the intent of the Legislature that the new funding method:

> "ensures greater equity in funding among SELPAs, avoids unnecessary complexity, requires fiscal and program accountability, and avoids financial incentives to inappropriately place pupils in special education . . . The bill would also declare the intent of the Legislature to equalize funding among SELPAs" (AB 602 Davis, p.2).

Description of AB 602 Funding Formula

The AB 602 formula is a radical departure from the prior funding model and has significant potential for affecting special education services in California. As described in the CEC newsletter, it "not only affects funding for special education services in California, it also has the potential to dramatically alter the manner in which special education services are planned and delivered" (Kennedy, 1997, p.20).

The most fundamental difference with this new approach is that the basis for the system is the total number of students enrolled in SELPAs rather than the number of special education students being served. Another important aspect of the AB 602 formula is that while it protects SELPAs against any reduction in current funding

levels, it contains provisions designed to bring greater equalization in special education funding across the state over time. A third important element of this new formula is how students served in nonpublic schools (NPS) are treated for funding purposes.

Over time, the AB 602 provisions will provide comparable special education funds to districts with comparable ADAs. Initially, SELPAs have been assigned an amount equal to the funds received in the 1997-98 fiscal year from specified state, local, and federal revenues. This value is represented as a specified dollar amount per ADA. These dollars are multiplied by the SELPA's ADA to determine the total amount of special education funding to be received by a SELPA.

Equalization is an important component of AB 602. Once each SELPA's rate per ADA is determined, a statewide average can be calculated. Those SELPAs whose rates per ADA are below the statewide average qualify for an adjustment to bring up their rates commensurate with the statewide average, as adjusted for inflation. For SELPAs whose rates per ADA fall above the statewide average, future growth revenues for the SELPA will be calculated from the statewide average, gradually closing the gap between their rates per ADA and the statewide average.

These new funding provisions contain several significant elements regarding this potential to affect children's services. Virtually all of the fiscal incentives for particular placements that are associated with the old formula disappear under AB 602. For the most part, the amount of funding received under the new provisions remains the same regardless of how many special education children are identified or how or where they are served. This means local education agencies and SELPAs will be afforded a great deal more flexibility from a fiscal perspective in relation to special education placements. For the most part this includes incentives under the old formula for placing students in nonpublic schools (NPSs). This may result in NPS students returning to public placements over time.

The one remaining exception to the removal of these placement incentives pertains to students in licensed children's institutions (LCIs). The state continues to reimburse 100 percent of NPS costs for LCI students, which not only continues, but exacerbates a considerable fiscal incentive in favor NPS placements for LCI students. This issue is currently being reviewed through a separate study being overseen by the state office of the Legislative Analyst of the Departments of Education and Finance.

AB 602 is a Population-Based Funding Approach

One of the predominant themes in national special education finance reform over the past 5 to 10 years has been population-based funding. It is the fiscal approach adopted under the recently reauthorized federal Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), and has been adopted in various forms by Vermont, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, Montana, North Dakota, and now California. New York is currently considering a similar reform proposal.

- The rationale given for adopting such systems is that traditional funding mechanisms sometimes provide incentives for identifying more students, for assigning them to higher reimbursement categories of disability, or to higher cost placements. Population-based models are a way to reduce these incentives and to increase flexibility from a fiscal perspective. It is argued that they facilitate the placement of special education students in programs most appropriate to their needs. Population-based models are less complex than many existing formulas and are easier to understand.

An Unresolved Issue Regarding AB 602 Funding Systems

A potential problem associated with population-based systems, without some form of adjustment for variations in student need, is that they appear to be based on the assumption of an equal prevalence of students requiring special education. That is, one possible rationale for having districts or states of the same size receive the same amount of special education funding is the assumption that incidence rates for students with disabilities are approximately the same across jurisdictions. In contrast, traditional special education funding systems are based on virtually the opposite notion. Because some districts and states enroll larger percentages of special education students than others, or because they have a higher incidence of severe students, these SELPAs are seen to have a greater need for special education services and accordingly face higher special education costs. Thus, it is reasoned, some districts should receive larger allocations of special education aid than others.

A middle position is that while the need for special education services may vary across districts we lack the tools to accurately measure these differences. It is increasingly being argued that because of the subjectivity involved local identification rates and placement patterns are not good proxy measures of a districts' true need for services. A census-based approach results from this void. In California, however, concerns about the failure of this approach to adequately address variations in need for severe and high cost students led to this study.

The question of whether the true need for special education services, especially high cost services, is relatively evenly distributed across service areas is central to this study. As described in the request for this study, the bill (SB 1678) that resulted from the report "New Funding Model for Special Education" authored by Legislative Analyst's Office, Department of Education, and Department of Finance (also known as the "Three Agency Report", November 1995) was withdrawn, at least partly, due to concerns about "the assumed equal distribution of disabilities among SELPAs." Later, during the ultimate passage of AB 602, this question once again became a key issue. The commitment by the state to conduct this study is the basis upon which this issue was temporarily resolved.

Chapter 3

Severity Analysis

Is the observed variability of incidence of students with severe disabilities across California greater than might be expected by chance alone and, if so, is this variation significant from a policy perspective? These are the questions addressed by the analyses in this chapter. Several important premises appear to underlie these questions. A first premise is that observed rates of *identification* and *service* of students in special education may differ significantly from some true *incidence* of disability. Second, they appear to assume that *severity* of disability, if known precisely, is related in some systematic way to *cost* of disability (i.e., the general level of resources needed to provide appropriate educational programs). Further, they suggest that disabilities considered "severe" are subject to less error in identification -- i.e., rates of identification are equal to *true* incidence rates -- and that, once identified, students with severe disabilities will require educational programs of somewhat similar cost. The initial problem with creating a straigtforward analysis to answer these questions arises from the fact that all of these assumptions are untested.

This chapter will first discuss the concepts and terminology used to describe variability of incidence, present possible sources of variability, and then offer statistical analyses of the variability of incidence for both severe and high cost students.

Origins of Analyses

The overarching aim of our analyses was guided first by the language used in recent legislation. This legislation required that a study "gather, analyze, and report on data that would indicate the extent to which *the incidence of disabilities, that are medically defined or severe and significantly above-average in cost, or both, are evenly or unevenly distributed among the population of special education local plan areas* (Chapter 854, emphasis added)." In the scope of this study, as issued by the state, an attempt was made to clarify the critical language related to a precise definition of the group of "disabilities under study (DUS)." The DUS group was defined as "(1) significantly above-average in cost and *either* medically defined disabilities *or* severe disabilities, or (2) disabilities that are significantly above-average in cost and both medically defined and severe (emphasis added)."

Concepts and Terminology

The rewriting of this language did little to disentangle the naturally overlapping concepts and constructs used to describe variability of incidence. The RFP of this study employed language that was somewhat different from the legislation to describe what it called "disabilities under study," or DUS. Use of the phrase "significantly above average" implies a statistical component to the definition of the DUS, but to a non-statistician, the term "significantly" is imprecise. That is, "significantly" could be interpreted as large or great from the perspective of a lay person. General understanding regarding the meaning of "significant" will vary. Rather, use of the term within a technical policy and fiscal context implies a variation that is larger than *reasonable expectation*. "Reasonable expectation" does have a precise statistical definition. The average, plus or minus small random variations, is the precise meaning of reasonable expectation in this case. "Significantly above average," in the context of this study, is interpreted to mean a discrepancy from the average that is larger than can be accounted for by chance alone. A second concern is the inclusion of both medical and educational defined DUS. The two criteria for "significantly," educational and medical, do not necessarily reduce the DUS to the lowest incidence disabilities nor do they guarantee an increase in the precision of identification (i.e., the trustworthiness of identification and service rates).

For example, all of the federally defined categories of disability eligible for special education have medically oriented definitions that use language and recommend identification procedures that either are the same as or closely parallel the language and procedures used in special education professional practice. These disability categories often have formal academic definitions as well as operational educational definitions. It is true that many low incidence disabilities are construed as more "severe" by some professionals and by the public at large even though no agreement exists about a natural gradation of categories of disability in terms of severity. Instead, the special education and other professional communities recognize "severity" as a dimension of disability that is independent of category.

Similarly, it is known that cost per student, taken as an index of severity, varies by category of disability and that some categories of disability tend towards higher per capita costs than others (Chaikund, Danielson, & Brauen, 1993). Nevertheless, it is equally clear that individual cases can and do arise that contradict any attempt to draw a strict relationship between category and cost. That is, individual students with, say, learning disabilities, may require services that are more costly than services required by some students with multiple handicaps.

The confusion of category and severity of disability, as well as the ambiguous relationship between severity and cost, are formally acknowledged and

accommodated in federal law (i.e., IDEA) and conforming state legislation. That category, severity, and cost are not strictly correlated and may vary for unspecified reasons is implicit in requirements for individualized identification, assessment and programming processes and procedures when school personnel suspect a student has a disability. The phenomena of variability of both inter and intra-state rates of identification is well documented and has been extensively debated (e.g., Algozzine & Korinek, 1985; Algozzine & Ysseldyke, 1983; Algozzine, Ysseldyke, & Christensen, 1983; Gelb & Miszokawa, 1986; Gerber, 1984; Gerber & Levine-Donnerstein, 1989; Hallahan, Keller, & Ball, 1987; Keller, Ball, & Hallahan, 1987; Nelson, 1982; Noel & Fuller, 1985; Singer, Butler, Palfrey, & Walker, 1986; Singer, Palfrey, Butler, & Walker, 1989).

Sources of Variability

One early interpretation of observed variability in identification rates, particularly for high incidence categories of disability, was that it reflected local variations in how school personnel understood and implemented identification criteria (e.g., see *Sixth Annual Report to Congress*, 1984). Under this interpretation, it was assumed that sufficient expert knowledge exists to unambiguously define and provide operational procedures for accurately identifying students with disabilities. These arguments basically held that observed variability in identification tended to reflect variations in local practices due to inadequate training, incompetence, or other idiosyncratic differences in personnel and management of special education.

This interpretation has been difficult to sustain over time. Although decreasing variability in identification rates within most categories of disability is found over time across states (Gerber & Levine-Donnerstein, 1989), *large variations* still persist within and across categories of disability. This variability persists despite the fact that schools now have over 20 years of experience with national, state, and local implementation of special education policy. Therefore, it is increasingly unlikely that continuing variability observed across such large units of analysis as states indicates systematic differences in adequacy of training or competence of school personnel. Rather, more likely is the fact that, by law, eligibility for special education does not and cannot rely solely on certification that a student qualifies by definition for a particular category of disability. Meeting strict definitional requirements for a category of disability is necessary but not sufficient basis for entitlement to special education and related services. In addition, assessment data must lead local school personnel to conclude that the presence of a disability *has a significant educational consequence*. How and why school personnel arrive at this conclusion provides an additional and legitimate source of variability in rates of identification.

Furthermore, in reaching conclusions about the educational consequences of disabilities, school personnel can and do consider the perceived adequacy of local resources when responding to educational problems. For example, a school that has never before enrolled a student with, say, multiple physical disabilities, is altogether less prepared to respond to such a student compared to a school that has previous similar experience. Therefore, extant resources -- in this case, the experience embodied in school personnel -- operate as a kind of lens through which disability and educational need are viewed by school personnel. It can be seen in this sense that "severity" refers to both the characteristics of a category of disability as well as the available resources or the cost of developing new resources. This suggests that variability possibly arises not from a random distribution of categories of disabilities across live births, but rather from a host of non-randomly distributed environmental factors both within and external to schools. In this regard, variability may represent significant competence on the part of school personnel in determining what array of locally available resources are likely to be satisfactory for achieving meaningful educational goals for specific students.

Statistical Meaning of Variability

The statistical construct typically used to indicate variability in the sense of dispersion around a mean is the *variance* or, when expressed in standard units, a *standard deviation*. It has a concise mathematical definition that indicates how large the observed differences are between each observation and the average of all observations. In examining variability of incidence rates, we are examining differences in what proportion of students are identified as disabled by different entities (e.g., school, district, SELPA, state, or nation).

While we may speak of identification or incidence rates for larger entities, such as a SELPA or a state, simply aggregating numbers from individual school districts can be misleading. Actual identification decision processes occur, as they should, at the lower levels of aggregation -- school and district. Few if any SELPAs have the power, means, or desire to enforce decision making criteria for all teachers within schools so that exactly the same students would receive exactly the same services regardless of location. This means, however, that incidence rates expressed at the SELPA or state levels represent only an arithmetic aggregation of many discrete local decisions. These local decisions are made in response to *objective characteristics* of students, local variations in *capacity* to provide relevant instructional or support resources, and *preferences* for some rather than other configurations of resource allocation for special education. Therefore, expressing variability of incidence rates across

California's 115 normal[2] SELPAs disguises what might be substantial variability in real decision-making conditions and outcomes across school districts *within* each SELPA.

Testing Statistical Significance of Variability

Interpreting the problem specified in the RFP of "even" or "uneven" distribution as a statistical problem, we framed our analysis as follows: Given that each SELPA operates independently to identify students, do we observe variations in incidence rates across the SELPAs that are greater than would be expected by chance alone? For example, statewide incidence for the six categories we used in our Low Incidence Category Model (see Table 3-1) is .47%. If only random factors related to, say, place of birth and residence, influenced this rate for each SELPA, we would expect to observe variations by SELPA of only plus or minus a few hundredths of a percent.

A suitable and appropriate statistical test exists to determine how likely it is that the observed variation in proportions identified under different definitions of severity has occurred by chance alone. This test is called a chi-square test. Essentially, as the difference between each SELPA's incidence rate and the state average becomes larger, the test statistic (chi-square) indicates an increasingly small likelihood that these differences have occurred by chance.

Modeling Severity

In our analyses, we first approached the issue of variability of incidence of severity by constructing and testing two different explicit models of "severity." In the first phase of analysis, we grouped low incidence disability categories, as a first approximation to describing a population with "severe" disabilities. In the second phase, we developed an approach of standardizing the resources allocated by schools to individual students for the purpose of identifying and comparing the incidence levels of "high cost" students across SELPAs.

Low Incidence Category Model

Using data collected by the state, we began with a simple model of severity using six categories of disability -- hard-of-hearing, deaf, deaf-blind, visually impaired, orthopedically impaired, and multiply handicapped. We calculated these disabilities as a proportion of total enrollment as an estimate of incidence.

[2]This number excludes four atypical SELPAs that operate much differently with substantially different types of enrollments, such as LA Juvenile Court Schools and California special schools.

As a group, these disabilities have been treated as "low incidence" disabilities by the state, and by definition consist of sensory and physical deficiencies that can be characterized by precise medically-oriented measurements (e.g., degree of auditory and visual acuity, range of motion, tonicity, gross developmental milestones). These disabilities are known to occur at low rates in the population and they appeal, we suspect, to the lay person's notion that they are somehow more readily, less ambiguously identified across regions and personnel than other categories of disability. In a second model, we added autism, which is considered by many to be a "severe" disability. Together, these comprised our two models of low incidence categories of severity.

We then applied the chi-square test of equal proportions to data for the 1996-97 school year for 115 *SELPAs of residence* (excluding LA court and state run schools). We further adjusted our incidence estimate by removing nonpublic school students residing in licensed children institutions (LCI). These students are removed from the analysis because it is known that their residential placements are non-random and current funding formula for these students reimburses SELPAs 100 percent of the cost for their placements.[3]

The analysis yielded test statistics that clearly demonstrate that variation is far greater than could be expected by chance differences alone in SELPA incidence rates using our definition of Low Incidence Categories, Low Incidence Categories Plus Autism, or, in fact, *any combination of categorical proxies for severity* (see Table 3-1). More precisely, there is far less than a one-in-a-thousand probability that differences in variation as large as we observe in the 1996-97 data would occur by chance alone. There is no reasonable doubt, therefore, that the SELPAs do vary in the incidence of children with severe disabilities residing within their boundaries, and that we cannot account for these variations by random influences alone.

[3] For a description of the methodology used to adjust for NPS/LCI students, see Appendix A-8.

Table 3-1. Summary of CHI-SQUARE Analyses Testing Significance of Differences of Incidence Rates for Severely Disabled Children (N = 115 SELPAs of Residence) [1]

Model of Severity	Total N	Mean% ADA	SD	χ^2
Low Incidence Only [2]	29,094	.47%	.16%	**3,112***
Low Incidence + Autism	33,820	.54%	.17%	**4,064***

[1] Excludes LA court and state schools

[2] Includes Hard of Hearing, Deaf, Deaf-Blind, Visually Impaired, Multiply Handicapped, Orthopedically Impaired

* For samples of this size (df=114), chi-square test statistics > 166 have probabilities less than .001

As can be seen in Table 3-1, the statewide average proportion of all students identified in 1997 in six or seven (including autism) low incidence categories, respectively, equaled .47% and .54%. If variations across the 115 typical SELPAs were due to random factors alone, observed incidence rates for these two models of severity would vary only by hundredths of a percentage point. In fact, however, the actual incidence rates range from .12% to 1.37%. Thus, the SELPA with the largest proportion of low incidence students residing within its boundaries has an incidence rate that is *more than ten times* higher than the rate of the SELPA with the smallest proportion of its students in low incidence categories. The magnitude of this difference is 140 versus 12 out of every 10,000 students.

The High Cost Student Model

Because the services that students with disabilities receive is a proxy measure of the perceived severity of educational needs, we created a second set of models of severity related to differential allocations of resources. In these models (described in the following chapters), we used state data from California Special Education Management Information System (CASEMIS), California Basic Education Data System (CBEDS), other sources and considerable input from the Advisory Committee to estimate a standard dollar value of the actual resource allocations schools had made for each of over 600,000 special education students in the state. These estimates allowed us to determine the state average value of educational resources allocated to students with disabilities and when these allocations might be perceived as substantially (e.g., equal to or greater than one standard deviation) above average for typical students in California. From these data, we could then characterize

SELPAs according to the proportion of their students (using total average daily attendance (ADA) as the base) with disabilities that were "high cost." The SELPA with the lowest incidence of severity, by this definition, had .13% of the students in its area of enrollment as "high cost", while the SELPA of highest incidence of "high cost" severity had 2.46% high cost students residing within its boundaries. Again, the highest and lowest SELPA differed by a factor greater than ten. When subjected to the same analysis described above, the results were substantially the same -- far greater ($p < .001$) variability than could reasonably be expected by chance variations alone (See Table 3-2).

Table 3-2 . Summary of CHI-SQUARE Analyses Testing Significance of Differences of Incidence Rates for Severely Disabled (N = 115 SELPAs of Residence) [1]

Model of Severity	Total N	Mean %	SD	χ^2
High Cost (%ADA)	66,304	1.12%	.39%	**7,263***

[1] Excludes LA court and state schools

* For samples of this size (df=114), chi-square test statistics > 166 have probabilities less than .001

Rank Order Differences Across SELPAs

Given that variability in severity incidence exceeded chance for both classes of models, our next task was to analyze whether category and cost models would identify the *same* SELPAs as more or less impacted by severe disabilities. The way we posed this problem was as follows. If we rank SELPAs according to the proportion of students with severe disabilities, using two different ranking criteria -- one based on category and one based on the percentage of high cost students -- will we produce the same rank order? That is, using rank as an index of relative impact on a SELPA of severity incidence, will a SELPA's rank based on proportion of high cost students predict its rank based on proportion of low incidence category students? If so, the factors contributing to having higher cost students are related to the factors contributing to having students in certain low incidence categories (see Table 3-3).

Table 3-3. Summary of RANK ORDER CORRELATION Analyses Testing Differences of SELPA Ranks Based Using Different Models of Severe Disability (N = 115 SELPAs of Residence) [1]

	% high cost	% low incidence
% low incidence	0.65*	
% low incidence (+ autistic)	0.71*	0.96*

* For correlations .32 or greater, $p < .001$.

[1] Excludes LA court and state schools

As can be seen in Table 3-3, SELPA rank based on percentage of six low incidence categories of disability is at least moderately related ($r = .65$) to rank based on percentage of special education students who are high cost. This correlation means that about half of the observed variability in rank position based on cost can be accounted for by rank position based on low incidence categories of disability. This relationship is stronger still ($r = .71$) if we include autism as a seventh category of low incidence disability, suggesting that incidence of autistic students adds measurably to the percentage of higher cost special education students in a SELPA. This finding re-emphasizes the interpretation that important factors *other than low incidence categories of disability* operate in SELPAs to produce higher cost special education students. The correlation in Table 3-3 means that about 65% (71% with autism included), or about two-thirds, of the variability in category rankings can be accounted for by the cost rankings for each SELPA. This means that about one-third of the variability is accounted for by some other variable or variables not represented by rates of identification of low incidence disabilities. The conclusion that must be drawn from this analysis is that the differential identification of certain low incidence categories of disability only partially accounts for the above average impact of high cost special education students experienced by California SELPAs.

Summary

Our analyses show that however we define incidence of severity -- either on the basis of low incidence categories of disability or measures of above average cost *independent* of category -- the observed variability across California's 115 SELPAs is much greater than would be expected by chance alone. Moreover, SELPA rank based on the proportion of low incidence category students in residence is only partially related to rank based on the proportion of high cost students in residence. In fact, in almost a fifth of all cases, a

SELPA's rank position changes radically when shifting from one criterion to the other. Therefore, whatever causes some California SELPAs to have a large proportion of students with low incidence disabilities does not forecast demand for larger levels of resources for some students, nor does the presence of many high cost students necessarily indicate identification of low incidence categories of disability. Different factors determine the distribution of high cost and low incidence categories of students across the state's Special Education Local Planning Areas.

Chapter 4

Factors Associated with Variability and Severe Service Intensities

There has been sustained debate about the underlying explanation for observed variability in identification or service rates (i.e., incidence estimators) since the early 1980s, particularly with respect to differences among the states and especially with regard to identification of high incidence disabilities. As cited in the *Sixth Annual Report to Congress* on progress in implementing (then) P. L. 94-142 (now IDEA), a report from the National Association of State Directors of Special Education (NASDSE) conjectured that observed variability was due to a) inadequate training of those identifying students, b) incompetent performance by these personnel, or c) idiosyncratic disregard for criteria and standards for identification. In fact, one often repeated speculation about the source of observed variability in incidence estimators (i.e. the proportion of enrollment identified for special education services) has been that it is due to systematic *errors* made by those who make referrals, conduct assessments, or determine eligibility. The implication, therefore, is that absent these errors, the numbers of students identified would begin to approach their true incidence in the population.

Consistency of Classification

There is very little empirical data, however, to support the argument that simple and easily "correctable" variations in local staff, or more specifically variations in their training, ethics, or competence, can account for much or most of the observed variations in incidence. Singer and her colleagues (Singer, Palfrey, Butler, & Walker, 1989) intensively studied data for a stratified random sample of 829 special education students representing six categories of disabilities from five metropolitan school districts. Represented in her sample were students with speech impairments, learning disabilities, emotional disturbance, mental retardation, hearing impairment, and physical, multiple handicaps. The percentage of student enrollment identified for special education in these five districts varied from 7.6% to 13.4%. Variability was observed not only for higher incidence, medically ambiguous, and less severe disabilities. Identification rates for hearing impaired, visually impaired, and physically, multiply handicapped students varied as well from .9% to 2.6%, .1% to .8%, and .9% to 4.1%, respectively.

Singer and her colleagues looked first at the similarities and differences of the student profiles identified in the same categories but in different school districts. Researchers

tested for statistically significant (reliable) differences between school districts for each of seven functional characteristics for each of six disability categories. The seven functional characteristics examined speaking level, academic ability, social skills, psychological well-being, everyday knowledge, hearing, and daily living skills. Very few (i.e., 12) differences proved to be statistically significant. Somewhat surprisingly, districts differed more in the characteristics of students they identified as hearing impaired and physically, multiply handicapped, than in characteristics of students labeled speech impaired or learning disabled.

These data support a more complex explanation for observed variations in incidence than school personnel being poorly trained, unethical, or incompetent. Overall, students with a given classification in one district are not meaningfully different in a range of functional characteristics from students with the same categorical classification in another district. On the other hand, districts are less than perfectly consistent in their classification of students with highly similar characteristics, even for categories of disability that could be considered both low incidence and medically defined.

The Role of Ethnicity, Language, and Social Class

Several early studies of national data implicated differences in social class, particularly racial and ethnic proportions in the underlying population of different states, as a major influence on identification processes. These researchers suggested that ethnic bias was at least a partial explanation for longstanding observed variations in incidence for some disabilities, especially where clinical impression weighed as heavily as objective measurement in identification decisions (e.g., LD).

Noel and Fuller (1985) hypothesized that an array of social as well as fiscal variables might explain variations in identification of disabled, especially learning disabled, students across the states. Their model succeeded in accounting for about 69% of observed national variability of total disabilities. In general, states with lower levels of supplemental state and federal aid identified disabled students at higher rates. The percentage of minority students was negatively related to the identification of disability as well. Measures of poverty and urbanicity (i.e. % of rural population) did not significantly relate to overall rates of incidence.

Gelb and Mizakawa (1986) conducted a similar national study with states as the unit of analysis. None of their ethic, income, resource, or social deviance measures correlated significantly with percentage of students with hearing, visual, or orthopedic impairments or the percentage of students with multiple handicapping conditions. In a regression analysis, these authors did show that percentage of ethnic minorities at risk (i.e., African-Americans and Hispanics), along with composite measures representing social deviance,

poverty, and income, did account for 72% of observed state variability in the identification of its students with educable mental retardation(EMR). These measures tended to have a different sign depending on the minority group in question. For example, higher proportions of African-American students in the population predicted higher EMR identification rates while higher proportions of Hispanic students predicted lower rates.

In a more sophisticated analysis, Nelson (1982) examined the simultaneous determination of total expenditures per pupil, overall prevalence rates for special education students, and expenditures for students with disabilities for 147 school districts in the state of Wisconsin. All fiscal measures related to per pupil expenditure level (+), special education per pupil expenditure (-), district wealth (-), Title I (i.e., Chapter 1) aid (-) and categorical aid (+) were reliable (i.e. statistically significant) predictors of special education student prevalence rates. Poverty rate also was an independent, negative predictor. That is, increases in percentage of students who were impoverished predicted decreased special education prevalence. In contrast to previous findings, Nelson found that percentage of minorities positively predicted percentage of disabled students. Only 28% of the observed variability in disability prevalence rates was accounted for by Nelson's model, although the collection of simultaneous models he examined provided a broader explanatory framework than had previously been attempted.

California Analysis of Incidence of Disabilities

Previous empirical literature has examined national data with states as units of analysis. Although several within-state district level analyses have been attempted, ours is the first of which we are aware that has focused exclusively on incidence of severely disabled students, defined both in terms of comparative standard special education program costs as well low incidence category. Our analysis is further unique because of California's size and because of the unusual administrative organization of 115 Special Education Local Planning Areas (SELPAs) that formed our units of analysis.

Conceptual Framework and Variables

For the purposes of this study, we proposed five variables that, on the basis of existing empirical literature, might independently or in combination play a role in explaining variability of severe (high cost) disabilities across California's Special Education Local Plannning Areas (SELPAs). These variables were selected to represent the relative impact on SELPA eligibility and service decisions of poverty, social class and language proficiency, SELPA size, SELPA resource capacity, and urbanicity.

Incidence of disabilities has long been associated with poverty via the primary influences of health and health care and the secondary influences of materially inadequate

childrearing environments. Congress recognized this relationship by building a poverty adjustment into its new funding formula under the revised and reauthorized IDEA of 1997. Similarly, social class as it relates to ethnicity may be a variable that affects disability independent of family income. For example, cultural differences across race ethnic groups may affect the prevalence of special education identification. Certainly, too, language proficiency may vary both within and between income and ethnic classes in California and further complicate the risk-for-disabilities present in any given community. Poor language proficiency certainly complicates diagnosis of disability in many cases but, because of language ability's centrality to academic and social learning, may act as an independent risk factor with highly impacted SELPAs.

In addition to these social variables, there are a number of organizational variables related to size, scale, and resource availability that potentially mediate decisions about eligibility and allocations for some rather than other kinds of disabilities. For example, medical facilities tend to be concentrated more in metropolitan rather than non-metropolitan areas. Larger scale school districts can manage the cost of low incidence disabilities better than smaller scale districts. Concentrations of individuals with some disabilities may develop historically around certain centers, regions, or agencies rather than others, contributing to non-random residence and migration of families of children with some disabilities. Thus, regional variations in organization location, size and/or structure, variables largely or completely exogenous to child characteristics, may be important influences on the observed incidence of students with severe disabilities.

Data Sources

Data for our analyses were provided from several archival sources. The CASEMIS (April 1997) database provided our basic counts and profiles of disabled students in SELPAs of residence as described in previous sections of this report (see Chapter 3). Basic data pertinent to district size and resources as well as the ethnicity and language proficiency of students came from the state's 1996-97 CBEDS database and was reaggragated to the SELPA level for analysis. Similarly, additional fiscal data reported on the J385C was reaggragated to the SELPA level and used for resource analyses. Finally, 1995-96 NCES data, using U. S. Office of Management and Budget categorical codings of agencies serving or not serving metropolitan statistical areas within select geopolitical regions, was used to derive SELPA measures of urbanicity.

Measures

For each variable, we selected or created proxy measures to investigate the plausibility of various explanations for observed variations in incidence of severe disabilities.

For poverty, we used the percentage of non-private school students in attendance within a SELPA who received free or reduced lunch (PRCTMEAL) and the percentage of non-private school students who received AFDC (PRCTAFDC).

For risk arising from social class and language proficiency, we derived two measures. The first was the percentage of current student enrollment classified as having limited English proficiency (PRCTLEP). The second measure represented the relative representation within SELPAs, again as a percentage of current enrollment, of statistically high risk ethnic groups (African-American, Hispanic, Pacific Islander, and Native American) (PRCTRISK).

SELPA size was represented by five measures, including current enrollment (ENROLL97) and average daily attendance (ADA97). In addition, to represent scale of operations, we used the number of school sites (SCHLS96) reported in each SELPA for the target 1996-97 school year.

SELPA resource capacity was represented by the ratio of total instructional expenditures to current enrollment (PERROLL) and by the ratio of students to teachers (STUDTCHR). Finally, urbanicity measures were derived in three ways. The first was the total number of "agencies" within a SELPA that met NCES definitions of agencies that served Metropolitan Statistical Area (TOTALMSA). Such agencies were the first *two* of the following three NCES-coded types.

NCES definition	Number	Percent
a. Primarily serves a central city of a MSA	152	14.5%
b. Serves a MSA but not primarily its central city	649	62.7%
c. Does not serve an MSA	266	22.8%
	1067	100.0%

For the second measure, we first used the number of agencies in each of the three NCES categories above to predict SELPA total enrollment. The differences (i.e., standardized residuals) between the predicted and actual enrollment was used as an index of urbanicity (i.e., RESIDMSC). In effect, total enrollment in less urban SELPAs tended to be related to the total number of agencies, hence the difference between predicted and observed values were relatively small. Urban SELPAs -- those with dense, metropolitan populations tended to have very few agencies but large enrollments. Thus, differences between predicted and actual enrollments tended to be large.

A final measure of urbanicity was based on the idea that individual school enrollments tended to be larger in more metropolitan SELPAs. By dividing the total enrollment by the number of schools in a SELPA, we derived a rough estimate of school size (SCHLSIZE).

In summary, we developed eleven measures to represent our five independent variables to test relationships with our two dependent variables as shown in Table 4-1:

Analytical Strategy

It was clear from previous work that measures of these variables may correlate with one another. Moreover, our own previous analyses presented in this report show that at least a moderate relationship exists between low incidence categories of disabilities (PRCTLOW) and relative costliness of individualized educational programs devised by SELPAs, although category of disability alone could not account for the value of resources expended by SELPAs for individual students. Therefore, we proceeded in our analyses by assuming that percentage of low incidence categories of disabilities contributed to the percentage of higher cost students in each SELPA (PRCTHIGH), but not the inverse. It is possible that some of our five explanatory variables (e.g., poverty, social class and language proficiency) were more directly related to proportion of low incidence categories of students than other variables. Proportion of low incidence categories of disabilities, in conjunction with various economic and structural variables, might constitute a better combination of factors to explain why some SELPAs have higher (or lower) proportions of higher cost students than others. Conceived in this way, PRCTLOW measures function as an outcome (dependent) variable in one phase of analysis, but as variable (independent) mediating PRCTHIGH in another.

Beyond the directional and separate effects thought to come from categorical and resource requirement characterizations of students in SELPAs, it is necessary to recognize that different explanatory variables might function differently with different subsamples of SELPAs. California's SELPAs are not homogenous on any relevant dimension. They represent sometimes vastly different political, demographic, and organizational attributes. In sheer size and scale, Los Angeles Unified School District SELPA is, for example, like no other. Several SELPAs are constituted from one school district while others contain many districts. Some SELPAs overlap perfectly with counties while other SELPAs represent portions of counties or several counties.

Table 4-1. Variables, measures, and their interpretations

	Variables	Measures	Interpretation
Independent	Poverty	PRCTAFDC	% receiving AFDC
		PRCTMEAL	% receiving free or reduced lunch
	Social Class/	PRCTRISK	% Pacific Islander, Native American, African-American, Hispanic
	Language Proficiency	PRCTLEP	% LEP students
	Size	ADA97	ADA
		ENROLL97	Total enrollment
		SCHLS96	# of schools
	Resource Capacity	PERROLL	Expenditures/student
		STUDTCHR	Students/teacher
	Urbanicity	RESIDMSC	Standardized residual for Enrollment = a + b(# MSA)
		TOTALMSA	Total metro agencies
Dependent	Severity	PRCTLOW	% students in low incidence categories
		PRCTHIGH	% students with high cost programs

These organizational variations influence everything concerned with decision making in special education including lines of authority, ease of communication, likelihood of coordinating policies, resource sharing, and fiscal management. Therefore, we attempted in our analysis to test the possibility that such complex organizational differences might be a major source of variation as well.

In general, our analytical strategy was to verify the utility of our measures by a correlational analysis and then to enter them into a regression analysis stepwise to test the following hypotheses:

H_1: Low Incidence Disabilities = *f*(Poverty, Size, Social Class & Languge Proficiency)

H_2: High Cost Disabilities = *f*(Low Incidence Disabilities, Size, Resource Capacity, Urbanicity)

Stepwise Regressions

The correlational analysis for our eleven independent (ADA97, ENROLL97, SCHLS96, and two dependent measures provided evidence of reliable relationship between and among measures as expected (see Table 4-2) We proceeded to perform stepwise regression analyses on our measures in two stages. First, all measures were allowed to enter the equation predicting percentage of higher cost students (PRCTHIGH). Measures that did not predict percentage of higher cost students were then allowed to enter a second stepwise regression equation predicting percentage of students served from low incidence categories (PRCTLOW).

Three measures, PRCTLOW, PERROLL and SCHLSIZE accounted for sbout 42% of the variability observed in PRCTHIGH. In the second equation, only one measure, percent of LEP students (PRCTLEP) predicted the percentage of low incidence category students served, accounting for only about 3% of observed variability in PRCTLOW. In other words, knowing the percentage of low incidence category students served, SELPA expenditures per student, and average enrollment per school, can account reliably for at least a portion of the variability observed among SELPAs in their percentage of *higher cost special education* students. On the other hand, none of our measures, except PRCTLEP, reliably predicted the percentage of *low incidence category* students in a SELPA.

Table 4-2. Zero order correlations and probabilities for eleven independent and two dependent measures[1,2,3].

	ENROLL97	PERROLL	PRCTAFDC	PRCTHIGH	PRCTLEP	PRCTLOW	PRCTMEAL	PRCTRISK	RESIDMSC	SCHLS96	SCHLSIZE	STUDTCHR	TOTALMSA
ADA97	**981**	-.027	.150	.177	**295**	.163	.219	**312**	**962**	**938**	**329**	.159	.191
	(.000)	*(.774)*	*(.108)*	*(.057)*	*(.001)*	*(.080)*	*(.019)*	*(.001)*	*(.000)*	*(.000)*	*(.000)*	*(.089)*	*(.040)*
ENROLL97		-.045	.131	.175	**281**	.162	.205	**315**	**974**	**964**	**342**	.184	.222
		(.629)	*(.161)*	*(.061)*	*(.003)*	*(.082)*	*(.028)*	*(.001)*	*(.000)*	*(.000)*	*(.000)*	*(.049)*	*(.017)*
PERROLL			.132	.127	-.073	.054	.076	-.087	.022	-.063	**-.287**	**-.289**	**-.296**
			(.158)	*(.175)*	*(.439)*	*(.560)*	*(.416)*	*(.354)*	*(.809)*	*(.499)*	*(.002)*	*(.002)*	*(.001)*
PRCTAFDC				.038	**313**	.020	.780	**402**	.153	.132	.048	.049	-.072
				(.650)	*(.001)*	*(.832)*	*(.000)*	*(.000)*	*(.102)*	*(.157)*	*(.607)*	*(.596)*	*(.440)*
PRCTHIGH					.064	**637**	.007	.098	.205	.169	.213	.231	-.105
					(.495)	*(.000)*	*(.936)*	*(.298)*	*(.028)*	*(.071)*	*(.022)*	*(.013)*	*(.263)*
PRCTLEP						.189	.672	**776**	**303**	.217	**429**	**338**	-.068
						(.045)	*(.000)*	*(.000)*	*(.001)*	*(.021)*	*(.000)*	*(.000)*	*(.470)*
PRCTLOW							.081	.107	.186	.141	.156	.210	-.086
							(.387)	*(.251)*	*(.046)*	*(.132)*	*(.095)*	*(.024)*	*(.361)*
PRCTMEAL								**681**	.230	.182	.074	.048	-.088
								(.000)	*(.013)*	*(.051)*	*(.429)*	*(.611)*	*(.345)*
PRCTRISK									**326**	**262**	**504**	**407**	-.013
									(.000)	*(.005)*	*(.000)*	*(.000)*	*(.890)*
RESIDMSC										**900**	**356**	.178	.000
										(.000)	*(.000)*	*(.057)*	*(1.000)*
SCHLS96											.222	.151	**391**
											(.017)	*(.106)*	*(.000)*
SCHLSIZE												**709**	-.020
												(.000)	*(.830)*
STUDTCHR													.058
													(.531)

[1] See text and Appendix A-5 for derivation and explanation of measures

[2] Correlations with probabilities less than .01 are in boldface.

[3] Probabilities are in italics.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Subgroup Analysis

When SELPAs were subgrouped by size and number of constituent districts for additional analysis, the results of the regression analyses changed. The 25 largest SELPAs (LARGEST) and the 25 SELPAs consisting of one school district (ONEDIST) were selected for these analyses. Similar to our original analysis findings, both PRCTLOW and PERROLL predicted PRCTHIGH for the one district SELPAs accounting for about 31% of the variability. For the largest group SELPAs, however, PRCT LOW and TOTALMSA, a measure of urbanicity, rather than the measure of SELPA resouce capacity (PERROLL) reliably predicted percentage of higher cost students. Measures entered for the large SELPA analysis accounted for almost 50% of the variability in PRCTHIGH. Average school enrollment, or size (SCHLSIZE), did not enter as a predictor for either subgroup.

Furthermore, PRCTLEP was not a significant predictor of PRCTLOW for either subgroup. For the largest SELPAs, only the urbanicity indicator, RESIDMSC, predicted the percentage of low incidence category students, accounting for about 17% of observed variability in PRCTLOW. No independent measure reliably predicted PRCTLOW for the one district SELPAs.

Simply stated, these latter results indicate that different measures predict differently for different SELPAs, especially for SELPAs characterized in terms related to scale and organizational differences. When we examined each SELPA subgroup more closely, we found statistically significant patterns that both differentiated subgroups from remaining SELPAs and from each other. Both subgroups differed from remaining SELPAs (i.e., larger vs. smaller, one district versus multidistrict) on all three urbanicity measures. Although school size was similarly large for both subgroups of SELPAs, large SELPAs tended to contain many more metropolitan agencies than smaller SELPAs and also in contradistinction to one-district SELPAs, whose one-district constituencies make them unique compared to any other SELPAs.

The 25 larger SELPAs also had more students per school and spent less per student than the 90 smaller SELPAs. Larger and smaller SELPAs did not differ, however, on the either percentage of low incidence category or the percentage of higher cost students identified. On the other hand, one-district SELPAs spent more per student and identified a higher percentage of higher cost special education students (1.3% vs. 1.1%). (NOTE: Further elaboration of these analyses are found in Appendix A-5.)

Summary and Conclusions

The results of our analyses showed that variations in low incidence categories of disability, resource capacity, and urbanicity provide a partial explanation for variability in the proportion of higher cost special education students across 115 California Special Education Local Planning Areas (SELPAs). These results are consistent with earlier findings for samples of states (Noel & Fuller, 1985, related to incidence of learning disabilities), districts in the same state (Nelson, 1982) or metropolitan areas (Singer et al., 1989).

However, contrary to earlier analysis of national (Gelb & Mizakawa, 1986; Noel & Fuller, 1985) and state (Nelson, 1982) special education incidence data, our analysis found that measures of poverty or ethnicity provided no explanation for observed variability in incidence of disability across SELPAs.

We did find a positive, small, but reliable influence of language proficiency on proportion of low incidence category students. Beyond the possibility that language differences seriously complicate the special education classification process, it is more likely that this small effect reflects health, medical, and morbidity differences in California's large immigrant population. Low incidence categories of disability may arise more directly from maternal and perinatal health factors than other categories of disability. We used no clear health or medical status related measures in our analyses but it is possible that our measure of the prevalence of limited English proficiency in SELPAs captured the relatively higher health risk of that population.

In summary, it is clear that whatever factors produce differences in low incidence categories of disabilities across all SELPAs also contribute to differential incidence of higher cost students. Resource capacity and scale provide additional, though smaller, influences to differences in high cost special education student incidence. SELPAs that spend more per pupil on average also identify more higher cost special education students. Moreover, the larger the schools in a SELPA, the larger the proportion of high cost students.

It is possible that these factors work together through some unspecified and more complex organizational filter. For example, large, multidistrict SELPAs may enjoy some benefits of scale with regard to services for severely disabled students. They actually spend less on average per pupil overall than smaller and one-district SELPAs but may achieve other efficiencies of scale, perhaps related to service differentiation and specialization across constituent districts to provide higher cost programming for disabled students. It may also be true that lower expenditures per student provide a less adequate baseline of

instructional effort, thereby amplifying special education program needs for students with disabilities in these SELPAs.

SELPA size alone may contribute to incidence of higher cost disabilities. but it is also clear that SELPAs composed of a single large, metropolitan school district behave quite differently. Despite similar proportions of students with low incidence category disabilties, and similar overall school sizes, these SELPAs spend more on average per student and have a higher proportion of high cost special education students.

It is quite possible that inclusion of indicators of medical and other health risk might help account for variations in the number of high cost special education students across SELPAs. We know only that the relative proportions of low incidence category students in one-district SELPAs are similar to those for multildistrict SELPAs. Therefore, the number of low incidence students does not seem to account for larger proportions of higher cost special education students. It may be that greater resource capacity in these SELPAs in conjuction with urban scale helps to improve special education service capacity. Singer et al.'s (1989) data would lead us to believe that metropolitan districts may develop special decision habits and capacities relative to some disabilities which creates historical biases towards some rather than other models of resource allocation in special education. It would seem that factors related to the organizational contiguity of SELPA and metropolitan district accounts for these interesting differences, but more study will be needed to reveal what these factors may be and how they operate in response to state fiscal policy.

A primary policy question confronting this study is whether a single or some set of factors beyond district control (e.g. poverty and/or urbanicity) could serve as the basis for valid and reliable adjustments to state special education funding. That is, could they serve as proxy measures for variations in the severity of special education students residing in SELPAs? An example of the use of an external measure for such purposes is the pverty adjustment to be applied to the allocation of IDEA grants to the states. However, the analysis presented in this chapter does not support the use of such measures as reliable proxies for variation in the incidence of severe and/or high cost students in California.

Chapter 5

Interviews with SELPA Directors

Telephone interviews were conducted with 17 SELPA directors to gain an understanding of the variability in overall special education identification rates relative to the proportion of students with low incidence and/or severe disabilities, and factors contributing to high service costs for these students. The SELPAs were selected based on their rankings within their state based on relatively *higher* proportions of students with low incidence disabilities (n=8), and high cost students (n=6). In addition, 3 SELPAs were selected to examine why their overall special education identification rates were *low* in relation to the percent of high cost students. A list of the SELPAs interviewed can be found in Appendix A-19

Interviews were conducted by four persons using a standard protocol as a guide. Interviews were open-ended and directors were encouraged to expand on any question or provide additional information not addressed by the questions. The protocol sought information from the directors in a variety of areas, including:

- Knowledge of their SELPAs ranking on incidence, cost, etc. relative to other SELPAs
- Opinions of which types of students are most costly to provide special education and related services, whether the numbers or characteristics of such students are changing, and the reasons for those changes.
- Factors contributing to decisions to provide certain high cost services to certain students (e.g., placements, related services, assistive technology, litigation, etc.)
- Perception regarding trends in high vs. low cost students and what factors may reduce or increase costs (e.g., general education teacher/school capacity, changes in professional roles and responsibilities, state funding formula, etc.)
- General observations regarding the state funding formula and how high cost students might best be served.

Following is a summary of the findings within each of the broad question areas:

Knowledge of Rankings

Almost every director was surprised at their SELPA's ranking within the state. Of course, SELPAs with a high ranking based on larger than average percentages of low incidence and high cost students were less surprised, because nearly everyone replied they had "many" of such students. Various explanations were offered for why their SELPA was ranked where it was.

At the SELPA level, it was commonly cited that the more affluent districts had higher identification rates or at least higher referral rates. According to directors, parents with more knowledge of interventions as well as more access to lawyers have more "clout." Not only can these parents get their child identified as eligible for special education, but they are also the most consistent factor associated with increasing costs per child.

Directors of SELPAs that had low percentages of high cost students were at a loss to explain why their SELPAs percentages were ranked toward the bottom, although at least one speculated that it may be because they focused on early intervention and "loaded up services at the front-end," thus reducing lifetime costs per child.

Patterns in Incidence

All directors reported increases in the numbers of students being identified as autistic and as having Serious Emotional Disturbance (SED). These perceptions are substantiated by the state wide data shown in Table5-1 Recognized as a disability condition in California since 1992/93, autism enrollments grew over 70% over the next four years. Over the past six years, enrollments of seriously emotionally disturbed (SED) students grew by nearly 46% compared to 20% for all of special education students in the state.

Generally, the increases in autism were credited to be among children with more affluent parents, while increased identification of SED was seen among all segments of the school population. In addition, the directors reported that the SED population was increasing among younger children, and that these students were also presenting more significant problems, including very severe emotional problems, sexual assaults, arson, and other violent behaviors.

Table 5-1. Changes in Autism and Severe Emotional Disturbance Enrollments (Ages 6-21) 1990/91 - 1995/96

Student Count

	Autism	Severe Emotional Disturbance	Deaf	Deaf-Blind	Visual Impairments	Multiple Handicaps	Orthopedic Impairments	All Disabilities
90/91	0	12344	6194	109	2679	5549	7152	425711
91/92	0	13507	6472	113	2825	5567	7661	446378
92/93	1605	14163	6863	116	3037	5271	8427	462886
93/94	1911	15278	7056	141	3107	5185	9406	478464
94/95	2412	16372	8190	154	3265	5186	9881	492028
95/96	3064	18020	8643	166	3453	5333	10253	510875

Percent Change

	Autism	Severe Emotional Disturbance	Deaf	Deaf-Blind	Visual Impair-ments	Multiple Handicaps	Orthopedic Impair-ments	All Disabilities
90/91								
91/92	0.00%	9.42%	4.49%	3.67%	5.45%	0.32%	7.12%	4.85%
92/93	0.00%	4.86%	6.04%	2.65%	7.50%	-5.32%	10.00%	3.70%
93/94	19.07%	7.87%	2.81%	21.55%	2.30%	-1.63%	11.62%	3.37%
94/95	26.22%	7.16%	16.07%	9.22%	5.09%	0.02%	5.05%	2.83%
95/96	27.03%	10.07%	5.53%	7.79%	5.76%	2.83%	3.76%	3.83%
90-96	90.90%*	45.98%	39.54%	52.29%	28.89%	-4.05%	43.36%	20.01%

* Percent change from 1992/93 - 1995/96. Autism was not recognized as a disability in California prior to the 1992/93 school year.
Source: Annual Reports to Congress, 1992-1997

The increase in autism is likely due to several factors: the broader classification of autism in the Diagnostic Statistical Manual III (DSM III) that refers to "Autism Spectrum Disorder", and the notion that autism is no longer just a very severe disorder but can manifest itself in "milder" symptoms. Also, expectations have increased regarding how much these students can learn. In addition, parents are becoming more aware of the category due to advocacy on the part of the local autism society. As several directors stated, "It is the disability du jour." "Autism is very fashionable and acceptable." Although two SELPA directors believed there were real biological causes for this increase, perhaps due to social or environmental changes.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Other low incidence rates are perceived as stable. Interestingly, seven SELPA directors reported a recent "blip" in either visually impaired (VI) and/or deaf and hearing impaired (HI). One SELPA served five VI students eight years ago and today has 71. Yet, as these increases were attributed to changes in medical technology for involving low birth weight or other at-risk infants, they were seen as one-time events as opposed to a trend.

Cost Factors

In general, across all SELPAs, the two types of students associated with high costs were those with autism and SED. Below is a summary of factors cited by SELPA directors increasing special education costs.

1. For students with autism the costs were almost uniformly attributed to Discrete Trial Training (DTT) which is said to be "sweeping" the state. Discussions about DTT generated the most emotion and concern. Directors referred to "DTT pandemonium" and "the DTT budget breaker." The costs tend to be extraordinary and the lack of professional control over how and where these programs are provided causes enormous concerns to SELPA directors. The DTT program, developed by Dr. I. Lovaas at UCLA, is designed for young autistic children and requires intensive one-on-one intervention for extensive periods of time each day. Periodically, the SELPAs around the Los Angeles area were the most impacted. However, the requests for DTT were increasing in all but one SELPA included in the interviews. There are very high personnel costs associated with DTT. Many of the SELPAs are contracting with non-public agencies that provide the specially trained aides who work with individual children in their homes.

   Costs in one SELPA were reported at $30,000 to $50,000 per child. In this SELPA, a private provider trains and pays aides about $12.50/hour, but bills the SELPA for $23/hour. Supervision of the in-home aides is typically billed around $150/hour for 2-3 visits per month. Two SELPAs reported that they had children receiving DTT directly from Dr. Lovaas' clinic and these costs were over $120,000 per year. Several directors now require parents to remain in the home during DTT sessions because some parents were reported to be using the aides as baby sitters. In an effort to control DTT costs some SELPAs are moving to create their own DTT programs, which require one-on-one aides. Despite this, directors consider in-school DDT classes to be far less expensive than contracting for services. All interviewed directors were concerned about the efficacy of DTT. Several had ethical concerns about DTT

as well, but all perceive that they are under threat of legal action to provide the therapy. One director indicated that he has tried to refuse to provide DTT because of lack of efficacy data. But has been in hearings over this; another director believes that DDT works for some autistic students and should be one option in an overall program for students with autism.

2. Costs associated with students with SED were attributed to non-public placements as well as extensive staff costs, including aides, for "in-house" programs. Most of the SELPAs included in these interviews had used non-public placements extensively for students with SED. Statewide data show that the percentage of public school children enrolled in NPS has nearly doubled over the past ten years. Various reasons were offered for this pattern of growing NPS use. One director believed that the previous funding formula favored this approach and since local districts and building principals were happy to have the more aggressive students out of their buildings they tended not to look at other options. Although the new AB 602 special education funding formula for the state will largely relieve the fiscal incentives to place students in NPS, for children in licensed childrens institutions (LCIs) the fiscal incentives for NPS placement have become even more pronounced under AB 602.

   Another director in a highly urban SELPA believed that the mandated collaboration with county mental health has contributed to the use of more non-public placements. The director believed parents tend to "trust" the mental health professionals more than the schools, and those professionals believe that the residential and day programs offer better mental health services. This has also been raised as an issue in conjunction with the NPS study being conducted by the state concurrent with this analysis. These issues are described in more detail in this report. Several directors also noted that more affluent parents seek non-public placements for their children with SED, even "when the SELPA can offer a very supportive and appropriate placement." This contention may be worthy of further investigation by the state. Although family income information is not available for individual students, the state's CASEMIS data (see Table 5-2) show non-white students to be under represented in relation to the state population as a whole (60% versus 51% in NPS). This is especially true for Hispanic children, who represent 41% of the state's public school enrollment, but only 19% at NPS enrollments.

Table 5-2. Race/Ethnicity and Gender of Students in California Public Schools, in Public Special Education Programs, NPSs, and NPSs/LCIs

Students	White	Hispanic	Black	Asian	Other	Total
All public school	40%	41%	9%	9%	1%	100%
Public special education	43%	37%	14%	3%	3%	100%
NPSs	49%	19%	30%	1%	1%	100%

However, even as SELPAs are attempting to create more public programs for SED students, they recognize the need to staff these well, including providing sufficient aides. One director believes that non-public placements are more cost effective for some students with SED, if their individual service plans, include full-time aides and/or therapies, begin to exceed $20,000 per year. A big factor in the ability to create public school programs for students identified as SED is the availability of effective teachers. The lack of experienced and well-trained teachers who can successfully educate and manage students with SED in either special day classes (SDCs) or less restrictive placements is considered a big barrier to creating effective programs.

3. Other services or supports that drive up costs for an individual child are the amount of occupational therapy (OT) and physical therapy (PT) (specifically the latter), personal aides or nurses, and technology. The costs of providing OT and PT were not perceived as extraordinary, but several directors noted that there is an increasing tendency to give many low incidence students more hours of these services than is "probably" necessary because "parents (and professionals) want them and assume that more is better." One director is developing standards of practice to help teachers of low incidence students look more closely at individual needs and monitor progress more closely. SELPA directors that were close to large medical centers also noted that availability of OT and PT increased the demand. More parents know about the services and want the maximum amount of hours for their child.

   Only three directors specifically noted increased use of personal aides as a cost factor and only one spoke of the need to provide nurses to medically fragile students. However, almost all directors noted increased service need among low incidence students, particularly those requiring medical services or technologies.

Generally, however, technology costs were not perceived to be a great factor in increasing costs, although several directors noted that requests for assistive technologies were starting to climb. These costs can be particularly high for the sensory impaired and some students with very significant physical disabilities, although almost every director who mentioned assistive technology noted that these individualized supports tended to be one-time investments and that costs were amortized over time. Several directors noted an increase in parental requests for laptops and personal computers, for both high and low incidence students, probably due to greater publicity about the right to assistive technology as well as an awareness of what a student might be eligible to receive, irrespective of individual need.

4. Cultural factors are perceived to be related to costs. First, all directors noted that affluent, informed parents are the most likely to request that their child be found eligible for special education as well as receive more services. All but two directors cited parental requests coupled with fear of litigation, as the primary factors related to providing more intensive and costly services. In contrast, three directors expressed concerns about their Hispanic students whose parents often demand little or nothing and whom they fear may be under-served (see comments above and data in Table 5-2). This is perceived to be prevalent among first-generation families. One director has worked with a community organization to attempt to identify any under-served Hispanic students, such as those who are deaf or have severe physical disabilities. Two directors noted the impact that high proportions of English language learners can have on overall special education incidence. They noted that students with language problems can fall farther and farther behind in school until they become "eligible" for special education. They note that, while they make every effort to discriminate between "true" disability and language differences, the bottom line is that when a student is failing, special education is usually the only option. However, even if these students are identified, they are tend to receive less costly services (Table 5-2 also shows Hispanic students to be somewhat under represented in special education (37%) compared to overall public school enrollments (70.5%)).

5. Class size reduction was noted by several directors as contributing to costs, because they see the reductions as increasing referrals and identification in special education. The reasons given were because so many inexperienced teachers have been hired to meet the new reduced class sizes, the directors believe that they are less able to manage students with learning and/or

behavioral problems, and quicker to refer them to special education. Although this counters the expected result from the state's major class size reduction programs (i.e. that reduced size classes would reduce special education referrals). However, claims of increased referrals in conjunction with the state's class size program are supported by research conducted on this phenomenon in Santa Barbara County (Gerber, 1998).

Reducing Costs

Directors were asked to comment on how they might decrease the costs of serving "high cost" students. The most prevalent suggestions was to create standards of practice that would guide the provision of such services as DTT, and create more "in-house" programs for students with SED. Most of the directors expressed a need for a defensible set of standards that could guide what types of services represent best practice. In particular, they would like the CDE to provide a comprehensive review of DTT and determine its efficacy and, at minimum, set some standards for the conditions for providing such services. Currently, each director believes that he/she are legally vulnerable because they must either agree to contract or provide the identical type of program in the SELPA. Comparing DTT to other programs for children with autism is like, in the words of one director, comparing "apples and oranges;" one may not be better than the other, they are different and parents won't accept a substitute. Similar types of standards for OT. PT, and assistive technology would also be useful or better allocate these increasingly scarce and costly services.

In the absence of standards, several directors would like to see the CDE provide some sort of voucher to parents seeking DTT or other unusual or "exotic" therapies (e.g., dolphin therapy) that are offered privately. Parents could use vouchers to buy the service and virtually take the SELPA out of managing the various contractors.

With respect to students with SED, directors believe that they will need to create more programs in their districts under the new funding formula. They see the greatest challenge to this being the lack of well-trained classroom teachers and a rich array of mental health services that students need and parents want.

About half of the directors did not see any options and expressed the opinion that costs will continue to rise as student needs intensify and more parents seek the new or different treatments or technologies. Two directors mentioned collaboration and working with parents to avoid litigation as ways of reducing costs.

Chapter 6

Development and Specification of Service Model

The purpose of this analysis is to develop a uniform set of procedures for measuring variations in services received by students across the state. With help from the Advisory Committee, the research team constructed a model that compared the placement and related services of students to the special education personnel providing these services. This analysis is conducted primarily on the California Special Education Management Information System (CASEMIS), and the Special Education Personnel Data Report.

For each special education student in California, CASEMIS shows disability, placement, related services received, SELPA of residence, and a host of demographic information such as age, sex, race, and residential status. In addition, the Special Education Personnel Data Report provides information on the numbers of teachers, administrators, and other certificated staff providing special education services. The state's J-50 files supplemented this with selected financial information and the distribution of aides.

Using CASEMIS and the state's personnel data report for standardized counts of special education personnel by job category, quantities of teacher and aide time were assigned to individual students based on their primary special education placement and the related services received. For example, Language and Speech is one of the related services listed on CASEMIS. Concurrently, the Personnel Data Report provides a count of Language and Speech Specialists statewide. We generated a count of the total number of students receiving speech therapy statewide and compared it to the total number of language and speech specialists across the state for the purpose of determining a ratio of services to personnel (see Appendix A-2 for complete service/personnel crosswalk). This ratio was then multiplied by a single statewide standardized teacher salary and benefit amount. This value was the projected cost of salary and benefits for one student receiving speech therapy. This approach was applied for all instructional services and placements in CASEMIS. The results of this program and service cost analysis are summarized in Table 6-1, column c.

Table 6-1. Estimated State Average Unit Cost by Placement and Related Service

Placement Category (a)	Subcategory (b)	Salary with Benefits (c)	Instructional Cost (d)	Cost Including Administration (e)	Total Number of Students (f)	Total Number of Staff (g)
SDC						
	Mentally Retarded	$6,345	$6,476	$9,355	31,344	5,699
	Hard of Hearing	$9,971	$10,176	$14,701	3,312	946
	Deaf	$11,633	$11,872	$17,151	3,118	1,039
	Speech/Language Impaired	$6,345	$6,476	$9,355	13,903	2,528
	Visually Impaired	$9,971	$10,176	$14,701	2,684	767
	Seriously Emotionally Disturbed	$11,357	$11,590	$16,744	9,038	3,228
	Orthopedically Impaired	$10,664	$10,883	$15,723	9,542	3,067
	Other Health Impairment	$6,345	$6,476	$9,355	4,376	796
	Specific Learning Disability	$5,008	$5,111	$7,384	89,590	11,199
	Deaf-Blind	$17,450	$17,808	$25,727	152	76
	Multihandicapped	$13,250	$13,522	$19,535	5,582	2,326
	Autism	$11,357	$11,590	$16,744	5,167	1,845
	Traumatic Brain Injury	$13,250	$13,522	$19,535	480	200
RSP		$2,873	$2,931	$4,235	273,468	22,096
DIS						
	Language & Speech	$905	$923	$1,334	248,811	4,466
	Home & Hospital	$7,813	$7,973	$11,519	2,686	416
	Adapted Physical Education	$927	$946	$1,367	47,969	882
	Audiological Services	$498	$509	$735	5,955	59
	Individual Counseling	$905	$923	$1,334	25,181	411
	Group Counseling	$905	$923	$1,334	25,181	411
	Guidance Services	$905	$923	$1,334	25,181	411
	Occupational Therapy	$1,246	$1,272	$1,837	6,237	154
	Physical Therapy	$744	$759	$1,096	1,792	26
	Orientation & Mobility	$3,459	$3,530	$5,099	1,764	121
	Parent Counseling	$905	$923	$1,334	25,181	411
	Social Work Services	$905	$923	$1,334	25,181	411

Table 6-1. Estimated State Average Unit Cost by Placement and Related Service *(cont'd)*

Placement Category (a)	Subcategory (b)	Salary with Benefits (c)	Instructional Cost (d)	Cost Including Administration (e)	Total Number of Students (f)	Total Number of Staff (g)
DIS	Vocational Education Training	$1,096	$1,119	$1,616	12,235	266
	Recreation Services	$927	$946	$1,367	47,969	882
	Vision Services	$5,774	$5,892	$8,512	13,816	1,583
	Specialized Driver Training	$5,774	$5,892	$8,512	13,816	1,583
	Psychological Services	$905	$923	$1,334	25,181	411
	Specialized Services Low Incidence Disabilities	$5,774	$5,892	$8,512	13,816	1,583
	Health/Nursing-Specialized Physical Health Care	$5,774	$5,892	$8,512	13,816	1,583
	Health/Nursing-Other Services	$4,730	$4,827	$6,974	8,575	2,091
	Interpreter Services	$4,730	$4,827	$6,974	8,575	2,091
	Education Technology Services	$4,730	$4,827	$6,974	8,575	2,091
	Behavior Management Services	$4,730	$4,827	$6,974	8,575	2,091
	Assistive Services	$4,730	$4,827	$6,974	8,575	2,091
	Braille Transcription	$4,730	$4,827	$6,974	8,575	2,091
	Reader Services	$4,730	$4,827	$6,974	8,575	2,091
	Note Taking Services	$4,730	$4,827	$6,974	8,575	2,091
	Itinerant Services	$5,774	$5,892	$8,512	13,816	1,583
	Adult Transition Services	$1,379	$1,407	$2,032	1,318	36
	Vocational Counseling	$1,379	$1,407	$2,032	1,318	36
	Deaf/Hard of Hearing Services	$5,774	$5,892	$8,512	13,816	1,583
NPS						
	Group A	—	—	$21,705	7,678	—
	Group B & C	—	—	$23,130	4,692	—

These services are organized around four possible placement options for students, Special Day Class (SDC), Resource Specialist (RSP), Designated Instructional Service (DIS)[3], and Nonpublic School (NPS).

In addition to calculating standardized instructional costs for each service and placement, multipliers were also uniformly applied to reflect nonpersonnel and administrative costs. Nonpersonnel costs were added to the salary and benefit costs (in column a) to equal the full instructional cost (column d). Administrative costs were added to the instructional cost (column e). These multipliers, derived from prior research conducted in the state, were uniformly applied across all students and SELPAs. The cost multipliers used in this analysis are described in detail in Appendices A-9 through A-12. Consistent with the standardized approach, students receiving speech in rural SELPAs would show the same standardized service cost estimate as that applied to students in urban SELPAs. The amounts used in the model for each placement and service are shown in column e of Table 6-1.

To develop a standardized cost for non-public schools (NPS), the research team used the J-50 report. NPS students were differentiated into cohorts of Group A, B, and C. Group A students are NPS students residing within the district. Group B students are LCI students whose parents live in the same district in which the LCI is located. Group C students are LCI who are originally from a different district and are placed in a district of service by an outside agency (i.e. not the school district). Average costs were calculated by summing NPS expenses for Group A, B, and C students, and then dividing them by the respective ADA for each cohort of students. Standardized cost estimates for each of the NPS cohorts are shown at the end of Table 6-1.

It should be noted that this is not an expenditure model. The cost values that are assigned to each service and placement were not calculated from SELPA expenditure reports. Services provided, rather than expenses incurred, were used to determine incidence of high cost students. The research team and the Advisory Committee considered it essential that this adjustment not simply reward SELPAs that have spent a lot of money in the past or encourage them to spend a lot in the future.

The research team used these standardized costs for placements and services to calculate an individualized projected total cost of services for each child in CASEMIS. For

[3]DIS is used as a primary whenever a student receives a DIS service, but does not have a primary placement in an SDC, RSP, or NPS.

example, a student with a Resource Specialist program (RSP) placement receiving language and speech services has a projected total cost of $5,569. This number is the sum of the cost for RSP ($4,235), and language and speech, ($1,334). Each child in CASEMIS has an individually customized service cost derived from this model. Tables 6-2 and 6-3 illustrate the individualized service cost estimates for 8 sample children drawn from the CASEMIS file.

Student 1 receives the placement "DIS" and the service "Language and Speech." The projected service cost for Language and Speech is $1,334. The placement DIS does not incur additional placement costs like RSP and SDC. Therefore the total projected service cost for this student is only the expense for the DIS service, which is $1,334. Student 2, on the other hand, is placed in an RSP, but does not receive any DIS services. This student's cost, then, is only calculated from the RSP placement of $4,235. Student 3 is similar to Student 2 in that he is only placed in an SDC and does not receive additional DIS services. The cost for this student is the value of an SDC placement for students with the disability "Specific Learning Disability."

Table 6-2. Sample of Students 1-5 and Unique Service Cost Estimates

Student	SELPA	Disability	Placement	Designated Instructional Services	Placement and Service Cost	Total Cost
1	Contra Costa	SLI	DIS	Language & Speech	$1,334	
						$1,334
2	Mid County	SLD	RSP		$4,235	
						$4,235
3	Mid County	SLD	SDC		$7,384	
						$7,384
4	West End	SED	NPS		$21,705	
						$21,705
5	Butte County	MR	NPS		$21,705	
						$21,705

The SDC placement costs are different from the other three placement options because the disability category is also considered in the cost estimate. For example, the SDC placement for a child with the classification "Mentally Retarded" is $6,345, while the SDC placement for a child with the classification "Deaf" is almost twice as large, at $11,633. These differences are due to estimated differences in the ratio of students to teachers and aides in each of these respective special day classes. In our example, deaf students have a smaller ratio of students to teachers and aides than mentally retarded students (see Appendix A-7 for a full breakdown of SDC teacher and aide ratios). These ratios were calculated to best reflect the actual class sizes of the various SDC placements.

Students 4 and 5 both receive the placement NPS. The service cost estimate for each of these students is $21,705. Even though most SELPAs negotiate tuition rates for their students with local nonpublic schools, we applied a standardized cost to NPS students across the state. In our example, the NPS cost estimate for Student 4 from West End and Student 5 from Butte County are identical. The only exception made in NPS cost estimates are between the Group A cohort of students, and the Group B and C cohorts of students. Group A students' service cost estimate is $21,705, and Group B and C's service cost estimate is $23,130. In this instance, Students 4 and 5 are both Group A students.

The next three students, as shown in Table 6-3, receive multiple DIS services.

Student 6 has the placement RSP and receives multiple DIS. Student 7 has the placement DIS and receives 5 DIS services. The CASEMIS system caps the actual number of DIS a SELPA can report for each student at 4. If a student receives 5 or more DIS, then the SELPA can select the option of "5 or more services." If a student receives 5 DIS, for example, DIS 1 through 4 will be individually labeled, and DIS 5 will only be labeled "5 or more services." It is impossible to determine from CASEMIS the exact type of DIS beyond the 4th DIS. The estimated service cost value for "5 or more services" is $1,830 (see Appendix A-13 for description of cost estimate). The total cost for Student 7 is the sum of all the DIS, $24,529. Student 8 receives 6 DIS; subsequently the DIS "5 or More Services" is listed and counted twice.

Once each child has a unique cost of service estimate, the next step in the approach was to aggregate individual students into their respective SELPAs of residence. The CASEMIS file lists both the SELPA of residence and the SELPA of service for each student. SELPA of residence was chosen when aggregating students back to SELPAs because residence

most closely conforms to the intent of the question posed by the RFP, whether the incidence of disabilities is randomly and evenly distributed across SELPAs. Oftentimes students are served in programs outside their SELPA of residence.

Table 6-3. Sample of Students 6-8 and Unique Service Cost Estimates

Student	SELPA	Disability	Placement	Designated Instructional Services	Placement and Service Cost	Total Cost
6	North Orange	VI	RSP		$4,235	
				Language & Speech	$1,334	
				Adapted Physical Education	$1,367	
				Orientation & Mobility	$5,099	
				Vision Services	$8,512	
						$16,312
7	Fresno Unified	MH	DIS	Home & Hospital	$11,519	
				Language and Speech	$1,334	
				Guidance Services	$1,334	
				Vision Services	$8,512	
				5 or More Services	$1,830	
						$24,529
8	Oakland	VI	SDC		$14,701	
				Orientation & Mobility	$5,099	
				Vision Services	$8,512	
				Occupational Therapy	$1,837	
				Language & Speech	$1,334	
				5 or More Services	$1,830	
				5 or More Services	$1,830	

$35,143

Additionally, the SELPA of residence is responsible for paying the costs of this child's placement. For instance, SELPA A might have an established occupational therapy (OT) program, and a neighboring SELPA, SELPA B, does not provide occupational therapy services within their SELPA. Instead SELPA B decides to place their students into SELPA A's program for OT. If we only looked at SELPA of service to count special education students, we would exaggerate the incidence of disabilities of SELPA A, and underestimate the incidence in SELPA B. The intent of the question posed in the RFP directs the research team to analyze the incidence distributed across SELPAs, and this is best answered by using SELPA of residence as the determining characteristic for placing students in SELPAs.

With this aggregation, the research team was able to calculate the total projected cost of services for each SELPA, as well as to calculate an average cost per student by SELPA. It is possible to compare these SELPA averages with the overall state average. The average statewide cost of services per student in the simulation to be presented in the next chapter in Table 7-1 is $6,249.

Chapter 7

Severity Service Adjustment

The research team concluded that an adjustment to the current AB 602 funding model should be considered by the state to account for differences in student needs across SELPAs due to the variations observed in the incidence of disabilities (Chapter 3). A number of alternative approaches were considered by the study team and the project Advisory Committee for developing a severity index for the state. The approach finally determined as most appropriate is based on the relative percentage and the total costs of high cost special education students in each SELPA.

The approach used to calculate the severity service adjustment focuses specifically on the population of high cost students in each SELPA. As described in Chapter 6 of this report, each student was assigned a unique service cost using standardized cost estimates. From these unique service costs, we were able to array students by cost, and subsequently by SELPA of residence. Using these arrays of students, we calculated the statewide average cost per student for all special education students, as well as determined the distribution of costs, or standard deviation, around the average. Based on the standardized approach, the average cost for all special education students is $6,417. The standard deviation is $5487. The sum of the mean plus standard deviation were then used as the cutoff of high cost students. All students with cost profiles at or above $11,904 ($6,417 + $5,487) were included in the severity service adjustment model.

With this array of students and costs, a severity service adjustment model was developed. The model compared the net costs of a SELPA's high cost students to the net revenues the SELPA will receive under their AB 602 base rate per student. The resulting severity service adjustment is calculated and applied through a set of procedures described below. The results are summarized in Table 7-1.

Steps to Calculate Incidence Multiplier

1. Determine a high cost cutoff amount.. The cutoff equals the mean overall special education cost per student ($6,417) plus one standard deviation ($5,487). The high cost cutoff amount used for this analysis equals $11,904[4].

[4]$6416.62 plus 5487.09 equals $11,903.71, which when rounded up equals $11,904.

2. Count the number of students over this cutoff amount and calculate the total service cost, using the standardized cost model, for each SELPA. See columns C of Table 7-1. Please continue to refer to Table 7-1 to follow the steps listed below.

3. Deduct the estimated NPS group "C" student count and the aggregate cost of their services from the counts in Step 2. The count of NPS group "C" students is shown in column D; the cost deduct for NPS group "C" services is shown in column K. (These amounts are deducted because these students are placed in SELPAs by outside agencies and their costs are funded under a separate state formula.)

4. Determine the percentage of high cost students by SELPA as a percentage of total ADA (col. I = col E divided by col. H).

5. Derive the statewide average percentage of high cost students (1.23%), and based on the variations in this percentage across SELPAs, derive a measure of the standard deviation (SD) of this distribution (.40%). The mean percentage (1.23%) plus the SD (.40%) was used as a ceiling on the allowable percentage of high cost students (1.63%).

6. For all SELPAs over this allowable high cost incidence rate (1.63%), calculate the difference between their actual rate and this allowable rate to determine the count of high cost students over the allowable rate (col. F).

7. Multiply this amount (col. F) by the high cost cut-off amount of $11,904 to determine each SELPAs deduct if in excess at the allowable ceiling high cost incidence rate (col. M).

8. Based on an array of the distribution of high cost students by total cost a natural break point was observed at $36,000. This was used as the ceiling allowable amount to be calculated for individual high cost students. The difference between this ceiling and the actual standardized cost estimates for these students was calculated by SELPA and shown in column L.

9. From each SELPA's total high cost student amount (col. J), deducts were taken for:
   a. NPS group "C" students (col. K)
   b. Exceeding the ceiling cost per student (col. L)
   c. Exceeding the ceiling high cost incidence rate (col. M)

This results in the total NET amount for high cost students by SELPA (col. N).

10. This high cost student amount per SELPA is compared to an estimate of what this amount would be if the SELPA were serving students at the state average (col. O). This average amount (col. O) is derived by the following steps:

    a. We determined the number of high cost students each SELPA would have at the statewide average incidence rate. This number, shown in column G, was calculated by multiplying the statewide average high cost incidence rate (1.23%) by each SELPA's ADA (col. H).

    b. Column O is the product of column G and the state average high cost student amount, $18,707. This average high cost student amount ($18,707) is calculated by dividing the net high cost total for the state ($1,324,701,129 from col. J) less the NPS group "C" students deduct ($84,748,320 from col. K) by the net high cost student count of 66,304 (excludes NPS group "C" students) from column E.

11. Column R, the excess high cost student amount, is the difference between what the district is providing to high cost students in relation to what they would be providing at the statewide average (col. O). This value only appears in column R when positive (i.e. col. N is greater than col. O), to indicate *excess* high cost student amounts.

    It should be noted that when column N is compared to column O, the deducts from column N (i.e. L and M) have not been applied to column O. For this reason, the excess high cost student amount shown in column R somewhat underestimates the full excess costs for this population of students. The deducts shown in columns L and M are designed to allow excess costs beyond the specified ceiling to be borne at the SELPA level, reducing any future fiscal incentives to provide high cost services.

12. The next step is to determine if the excess severity cost shown in column R is already fully or partially funded for individual SELPAs through base state special education allocations per ADA that are over the state average. This is done through the following steps:

    a. Column P shows an estimate of total revenues per SELPA by multiplying each SELPA's current base state allocation (col. B) by its ADA count (col. H).

b. Column Q shows what these revenues would be at the state average allocation per ADA ($426 from col. B) by multiplying this amount by the ADA count in column H.

c. Excess revenues over the state average (col. P - col. Q) are shown in column S when positive (i.e. when there are excess revenues over the state average).

13. The severity supplement for each SELPA (col. T) is the amount left from column R (excess high costs) after any excess revenues beyond the state average (col. S) have been fully counted.

14. The Incidence Multiplier (col. U) is calculated by dividing column R, excess high cost, by column Q, estimated total revenue at the state average. If supplemental high costs are not shown in column R, this multiplier is set at 1.0.

15. The Supplement per ADA (col. V) is calculated by multiplying the incidence multiplier (column U) by the statewide average ADA rate of $426. Column V represents the amount per ADA above the statewide average rate per ADA a SELPA is eligible to receive. Some of these funds are included in the SELPAs base rate (column S) and the balance in their severity supplement (column T).

16. With the Incidence Multiplier, it is possible to calculate the growth ADA rate for each SELPA, adjusting for the incidence of disabilities, consistent with the language of SB 1564, Section 17. Future growth ADA rate per SELPA is calculated by multiplying the Incidence Multiplier (col. U) by the state target AB 602 rate of $426 (also the average ADA rate of all SELPAs).

Based on the simulation shown in Table 7-1, the total cost to the state of California of implementing the severity supplement is approximately $57 million in the first year.

Most Fair, Feasible, and Appropriate

The method developed by the research team is considered "the most fair, feasible, and appropriate," as called for in the study description, for several reasons. The approach is driven by the services received by student rather than expenses incurred by the SELPA. The previous Master Plan formula was driven by placement units, which varied substantially across SELPAs. This system created the potential incentive to place and retain a student in an inappropriate special education setting. Furthermore, this formula did not recognize the variations in the relative severity within a single disability category. Services received, on the other hand, are a better indication of the level of severity of individual students, because it reflects as best as possible what the parents, teachers, administrators, and potentially the health care providers working with the individual student decide is most appropriate and necessary through the IEP process.

Consider, for example, two students who are classified as blind by their IEP and are both placed in a Special Day Class. Little can be inferred about the relative severity or cost of service between these two students. A severity-service approach, however, provides greater insight into the relative severity of each student. From CASEMIS, we can determine that Student One receives the designated instructional services (DIS) of vision services, braille transcription, guidance services, adaptive physical education, and note taking services. Student Two only receives vision services. Who is the more "severe" or "high cost" of the two? Judging from the services provided to each student, it can be inferred that Student One requires a higher intensity of services, and therefore is the more "severe" and "high cost" student. The severity service approach improves the ability to both identify severe students and adequately compensate districts for serving these children.

The severity service model also identifies "high cost" students and SELPAs. Using services received and the standardized cost estimates for each service and placement, high cost students and SELPAs can be more clearly identified. In the past, expenditure reports were used to identify high cost SELPAs. Such reports provided limited information on the nature of special education services being provided.

The feasibility of this approach is largely due to the comprehensiveness of the CASEMIS data file. CASEMIS provides detailed student-level information on a number of important variables, especially disability category, placement, and related services. It would have been much more difficult to construct a service model without such a resource. Further, the severity service adjustment is the most feasible approach because the data sets are familiar. These data have been designed and used by California agencies such as the Department of Education and Department of

Finance, as well as SELPA administrators, district officials, and school personnel. Thus the data are familiar, well known, and readily understandable to a broad constituency.

Although the methodology involves many steps, the basic approach is straightforward and calculated with the fewest assumptions possible. The methodology is replicable by the state to determine future severity service adjustments. The data may also interest agencies in future analyses, such as identifying high cost SELPAs, reviewing practices in high versus low incidence SELPAs, and understanding distributional patterns of particular disabilities across the state.

This approach is considered most appropriate because it does not create incentives to over or under-identify students in special education placements. AB 602 did much to eliminate the potential incentive under the Master Plan to place students in more restrictive environments, since such placements were linked to varying reimbursement rates. The severity service adjustment likewise avoids creating incentives or disincentives to inappropriately identify, place, and/or serve students. If a SELPA wished to increase their eligibility for funds, they would need to drive up their net cost for high cost special education students, and they would also need maintain a percentage of high cost students relatively close to the state average plus one standard deviation.

This option, driving up net costs for high cost special education students, is unlikely because it will be very expensive for the SELPA in the short run. We recommended that the severity multiplier be calculated only once every five years to discourage artificial decisions to "run-up" services to high cost students. Moreover, if a SELPA attempted to increase services, it would not be guaranteed an increase in its severity multiplier, because the multiplier is a norm referenced figure measured against the state average special education cost per student and per high cost student. If other SELPAs also attempted to increase their costs by driving up their services, the statewide mean for a high cost student would likewise increase. One SELPA could benefit only if the majority of other SELPAs did not increase their service delivery patterns. The state could also audit SELPAs that appear to be disproportionately increasing their services by using the CASEMIS data from 1996-97 (or any years prior to the adjustment) as a baseline.

Table 7-1. Severity Service Adjustment

A SELPANAM	B Current Base State SE Alloc/ ADA	C Count of High Cost Students	D Deduct NPS C Students	E NET Count of High Cost Students	F Students Over The % Cut-off	G # High Cost Students @ State Average	H Revised 97/98 ADA	I Percent High Cost ADA	J SELPA's Total Cost High Cost Students	K Deduct NPS C Student	L Deduct Amount per Student over Allowable Ceiling	M Deduct for Exceeding Ceiling Rate
ANAHEIM ELEM	332	121	1	120	-	233	18,986	0.63%	$ 2,353,153	$ 23,130	$ 10,174	$ -
ANTELOPE VALLEY	458	797	-	797	-	755	61,415	1.30%	$ 14,424,672	$ -	$ -	$ -
BAKERSFIELD	430	128	-	128	-	310	25,209	0.51%	$ 2,255,920	$ -	$ -	$ -
BUTTE COUNTY	462	298	7	291	-	405	32,899	0.88%	$ 5,369,845	$ 161,910	$ 317	$ -
CLOVIS UNIFIED	339	294	-	294	-	366	29,793	0.99%	$ 5,688,761	$ -	$ 5,152	$ -
COLUSA COUNTY	438	36	-	36	-	50	4,037	0.89%	$ 622,986	$ -	$ -	$ -
CONTRA COSTA	507	1,026	17	1,009	-	957	77,800	1.30%	$ 19,410,316	$ 393,210	$ 38,997	$ -
CORONA NORCO	352	329	34	295	-	361	29,379	1.00%	$ 5,989,245	$ 786,420	$ -	$ -
DESERT MOUNTAIN	426	451	4	447	-	844	68,643	0.65%	$ 8,233,886	$ 92,520	$ -	$ -
DOWNEY-MONTBELLO	378	565	2	563	-	621	50,491	1.12%	$ 10,182,128	$ 46,260	$ 129	$ -
E. SAN GABRIEL	406	1,932	217	1,715	-	1,596	129,788	1.32%	$ 36,005,569	$ 5,019,210	$ 28,410	$ -
EAST COUNTY	413	1,248	82	1,166	-	934	75,955	1.54%	$ 23,317,791	$ 1,896,660	$ 16,176	$ -
EAST VALLEY	432	1,028	106	922	-	910	73,966	1.25%	$ 20,932,590	$ 2,451,780	$ 18,329	$ -
EL DORADO	428	202	23	179	-	275	22,332	0.80%	$ 3,514,107	$ 531,990	$ -	$ -
ELK GROVE	465	527	77	450	-	468	38,096	1.18%	$ 9,854,518	$ 781,010	$ 6,321	$ -
FONTANA UNIFIED	339	231	4	227	-	377	30,693	0.74%	$ 4,279,633	$ 92,520	$ 6,039	$ -

SELPANAM	N SELPA's Total Net Cost High Cost Student	O Total Cost High Cost Student	P Estimated Total Revenues	Q Estimated Total Rev @ State Average	R SELPA High Cost In Rel To State Avg Svc	S Total SELP Revenues Over The State Average	T Severity Supplement	U Incidence Multiplier (Col Q / Col. P)	V Supplement per ADA ($above 426)	W Growth ADA Rate
ANAHEIM ELEM	$ 2,319,849	$ 4,367,378	$ 6,297,516	$ 8,087,874	$ -	$ -	$ -	1.0000	$ -	$ 426
ANTELOPE VALLEY	$ 14,424,672	$ 14,127,648	$ 28,150,146	$ 26,162,756	$ 297,024	$ 1,987,390	$ -	1.0114	$ -	$ 431
BAKERSFIELD	$ 2,255,920	$ 5,799,051	$ 10,831,982	$ 10,739,166	$ -	$ 92,816	$ -	1.0000	$ -	$ 426
BUTTE COUNTY	$ 5,207,618	$ 7,567,992	$ 15,214,338	$ 14,015,038	$ -	$ 1,199,300	$ -	1.0000	$ -	$ 426
CLOVIS UNIFIED	$ 5,683,610	$ 6,853,461	$ 10,108,896	$ 12,691,809	$ -	$ -	$ -	1.0000	$ -	$ 426
COLUSA COUNTY	$ 622,986	$ 928,727	$ 1,769,141	$ 1,719,894	$ -	$ 49,246	$ -	1.0000	$ -	$ 426
CONTRA COSTA	$ 18,978,109	$ 17,896,821	$ 39,472,726	$ 33,142,826	$ 1,081,287	$ 6,329,900	$ -	1.0326	$ -	$ 440
CORONA NORCO	$ 5,202,825	$ 6,788,180	$ 10,330,652	$ 12,515,360	$ -	$ -	$ -	1.0000	$ -	$ 426
DESERT MOUNTAIN	$ 8,141,366	$ 15,790,402	$ 29,225,442	$ 29,241,982	$ -	$ -	$ -	1.0000	$ -	$ 426
DOWNEY-MONTBELLO	$ 10,135,739	$ 11,614,833	$ 19,100,275	$ 21,509,315	$ -	$ -	$ -	1.0000	$ -	$ 426
E. SAN GABRIEL	$ 30,957,949	$ 29,855,937	$ 52,715,086	$ 55,289,714	$ 1,102,012	$ -	$ 1,102,012	1.0199	$ 8.49	$ 434
EAST COUNTY	$ 21,404,955	$ 17,472,336	$ 31,348,588	$ 32,356,728	$ 3,932,619	$ -	$ 3,932,619	1.1215	$ 51.78	$ 478
EAST VALLEY	$ 18,462,481	$ 17,014,799	$ 31,987,056	$ 31,509,422	$ 1,447,682	$ 477,634	$ 970,048	1.0459	$ 19.57	$ 446
EL DORADO	$ 2,982,117	$ 5,137,189	$ 9,564,117	$ 9,513,475	$ -	$ 50,643	$ -	1.0000	$ -	$ 426
ELK GROVE	$ 8,267,187	$ 8,763,485	$ 17,724,388	$ 16,228,951	$ -	$ 1,495,436	$ -	1.0000	$ -	$ 426
FONTANA UNIFIED	$ 4,181,074	$ 7,060,610	$ 10,419,276	$ 13,075,427	$ -	$ -	$ -	1.0000	$ -	$ 426

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 7-1. Severity Service Adjustment (continued)

A SELPANAM	B Current Base State SE Alloc/ ADA	C Count of High Cost Students	D Deduct NPS C Students	E NET Count of High Cost Students	F Students Over the % Cut-off	G # High Cost Students @ State Average	H Revised 97/98 ADA	I Percent High Cost ADA	J SELPA's Total Cost High Cost Students	K Deduct NPS C Student	L Deduct Amount per Student over Allowable Ceiling	M Deduct for Exceeding Ceiling Rate
FOOTHILL	339	610	14	596	-	586	47,676	1.25%	$ 11,923,918	$ 323,820	$ 47,878	$ -
FRESNO COUNTY	420	556	-	556	-	740	60,180	0.92%	$ 10,333,622	$ -	$ 24,788	$ -
FRESNO UNIFIED	386	946	-	946	-	888	72,237	1.31%	$ 18,004,243	$ -	$ 24,038	$ -
GARDEN GROVE	369	857	1	856	140	540	43,911	1.95%	$ 17,016,463	$ 23,130	$ 67,398	$ 1,670,776
GLENN COUNTY	530	36	-	36	-	73	5,903	0.61%	$ 620,785	$ -	$ -	$ -
GREATER ANAHEIM	350	524	1	523	-	627	51,003	1.03%	$ 11,141,242	$ 23,130	$ 26,579	$ -
HUMB - DEL NORTE	420	234	-	234	-	311	25,326	0.92%	$ 4,057,766	$ -	$ 11,632	$ -
IMPERIAL COUNTY	374	145	-	145	-	375	30,517	0.48%	$ 3,072,334	$ -	$ 4,672	$ -
INYO COUNTY	474	19	-	19	-	41	3,304	0.57%	$ 316,793	$ -	$ -	$ -
IRVINE UNIFIED	414	338	-	338	-	278	22,590	1.58%	$ 6,194,154	$ -	$ -	$ -
KERN COUNTY	386	497	-	497	-	1,015	82,515	0.60%	$ 9,330,514	$ -	$ 8,311	$ -
KERN UNION HIGH	269	164	-	164	-	302	24,552	0.67%	$ 2,997,079	$ -	$ 35,618	$ -
KINGS COUNTY	387	102	-	102	-	286	23,280	0.44%	$ 1,827,040	$ -	$ -	$ -
LAKE COUNTY	448	74	-	74	-	114	9,290	0.80%	$ 1,391,014	$ -	$ -	$ -
LASSEN COUNTY	702	43	-	43	-	64	5,214	0.82%	$ 718,461	$ -	$ 653	$ -

SELPANAM	N SELPA's Total Net Cost High Cost Student	O Total Cost High Cost Student	P Estimated Total Revenues	Q Estimated Total Rev @ State Average	R SELPA High Cost In Rel To State Avg Svc	S Total SELP Revenues Over The State Average	T Severity Supplement	U Incidence Multiplier (Col Q / Col P)	V Supplement per ADA ($above 426)	W Growth ADA Rate
FOOTHILL	$ 11,552,220	$ 10,967,242	$ 16,181,596	$ 20,310,053	$ 584,978	$ -	$ 584,978	1.0288	$ 12.27	$ 438
FRESNO COUNTY	$ 10,308,835	$ 13,843,618	$ 25,253,964	$ 25,636,765	$ -	$ -	$ -	1.0000	$ -	$ 426
FRESNO UNIFIED	$ 17,980,205	$ 16,617,098	$ 27,902,225	$ 30,772,928	$ 1,363,107	$ -	$ 1,363,107	1.0443	$ 18.87	$ 445
GARDEN GROVE	$ 15,255,159	$ 10,101,032	$ 16,204,754	$ 18,705,933	$ 5,154,128	$ -	$ 5,154,128	1.2755	$ 117.38	$ 543
GLENN COUNTY	$ 620,785	$ 1,357,804	$ 3,127,328	$ 2,514,495	$ -	$ 612,833	$ -	1.0000	$ -	$ 426
GREATER ANAHEIM	$ 11,091,533	$ 11,732,464	$ 17,852,081	$ 21,727,154	$ -	$ -	$ -	1.0000	$ -	$ 426
HUMB - DEL NORTE	$ 4,046,134	$ 5,825,810	$ 10,636,495	$ 10,788,757	$ -	$ -	$ -	1.0000	$ -	$ 426
IMPERIAL COUNTY	$ 3,067,662	$ 7,020,037	$ 11,406,730	$ 13,000,289	$ -	$ -	$ -	1.0000	$ -	$ 426
INYO COUNTY	$ 316,793	$ 760,152	$ 1,567,285	$ 1,407,713	$ -	$ 159,573	$ -	1.0000	$ -	$ 426
IRVINE UNIFIED	$ 6,194,154	$ 5,196,547	$ 9,350,857	$ 9,623,400	$ 997,606	$ -	$ 997,606	1.1037	$ 44.16	$ 470
KERN COUNTY	$ 9,322,203	$ 18,981,428	$ 31,878,717	$ 35,151,390	$ -	$ -	$ -	1.0000	$ -	$ 426
KERN UNION HIGH	$ 2,961,461	$ 5,647,839	$ 6,612,949	$ 10,459,139	$ -	$ -	$ -	1.0000	$ -	$ 426
KINGS COUNTY	$ 1,827,040	$ 5,355,127	$ 9,000,563	$ 9,917,071	$ -	$ -	$ -	1.0000	$ -	$ 426
LAKE COUNTY	$ 1,391,014	$ 2,137,047	$ 4,161,332	$ 3,957,561	$ -	$ 203,771	$ -	1.0000	$ -	$ 426
LASSEN COUNTY	$ 717,808	$ 1,199,505	$ 3,661,500	$ 2,221,343	$ -	$ 1,440,157	$ -	1.0000	$ -	$ 426

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 7-1. Severity Service Adjustment (continued)

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
SELPANAM	Current Base State SE Alloc / ADA	Count of High Cost Students	Deduct NPS C Students	NET Count of High Cost Students	Students Over The % Cut-off	# High Cost Students @ State Average	Revised 97/98 ADA	Percent High Cost ADA	SELPA's Total Cost High Cost Students	Deduct NPS C Student	Deduct Amount per Student over Allowable Ceiling	Deduct for Exceeding Ceiling Rate
LAUSD	493	11,560	633	10,927	610	7,785	633,052	1.73%	$ 224,520,575	$ 14,641,290	$ 95,768	$ 7,257,707
LODI	387	243	12	231	-	307	25,002	0.92%	$ 4,632,136	$ 277,560	$ 8,389	$ -
LONG BEACH	339	1,089	92	997	-	1,020	82,941	1.20%	$ 21,290,716	$ 2,127,960	$ 6,439	$ -
MADERA-MARIPOSA	373	188	-	188	-	307	24,965	0.75%	$ 3,616,887	$ -	$ 20,476	$ -
MARIN	637	441	127	314	-	332	26,974	1.16%	$ 8,695,420	$ 2,937,510	$ 3,800	$ -
MENDOCINO	806	296	85	211	-	181	14,759	1.43%	$ 5,775,935	$ 1,966,050	$ -	$ -
MERCED	263	630	-	630	-	576	46,828	1.35%	$ 13,402,990	$ -	$ 45,391	$ -
MID CITIES	396	751	32	719	-	878	71,366	1.01%	$ 13,956,588	$ 740,160	$ 9,981	$ -
MID COUNTY	404	602	53	549	-	565	45,978	1.19%	$ 11,176,688	$ 1,225,890	$ -	$ -
MODESTO	335	376	10	366	-	366	29,732	1.23%	$ 6,804,595	$ 231,300	$ 2,028	$ -
MODOC	923	13	-	13	-	25	2,053	0.63%	$ 201,498	$ -	$ -	$ -
MONO	660	22	-	22	-	22	1,783	1.23%	$ 342,904	$ -	$ -	$ -
MONTEREY	357	503	-	503	-	781	63,484	0.79%	$ 10,091,382	$ -	$ 38,917	$ -
MORENO VALLEY	392	388	22	366	-	358	29,131	1.26%	$ 7,517,063	$ 508,860	$ 12,521	$ -
MORONGO	440	139	2	137	-	114	9,310	1.47%	$ 2,732,024	$ 46,260	$ -	$ -

N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W
SELPANAM	SELPA's Total Net Cost High Cost Student	Total Cost High Cost Student	Estimated Total Revenues	Estimated Total Rev @ State Average	SELPA High Cost In Rel To State Avg Svc	Total SELP Revenues over the State Average	Seventy Supplement	Incidence Multiplier (Col Q / Col P)	Supplement per ADA ($above 426)	Growth ADA Rate
LAUSD	$ 202,525,810	$ 145,624,906	$ 312,073,040	$ 269,680,339	$ 56,900,903	$ 42,392,701	$ 14,508,202	1.2110	$ 89.88	$ 516
LODI	$ 4,346,187	$ 5,751,252	$ 9,671,260	$ 10,650,648	$ -	$ -	$ -	1.0000	$ -	$ 426
LONG BEACH	$ 19,156,317	$ 19,079,483	$ 28,103,072	$ 35,332,977	$ 76,834	$ -	$ 76,834	1.0022	$ 0.93	$ 427
MADERA-MARIPOSA	$ 3,596,411	$ 5,742,851	$ 9,322,033	$ 10,635,090	$ -	$ -	$ -	1.0000	$ -	$ 426
MARIN	$ 5,754,110	$ 6,204,991	$ 17,172,864	$ 11,490,920	$ -	$ 5,681,944	$ -	1.0000	$ -	$ 426
MENDOCINO	$ 3,809,885	$ 3,395,176	$ 11,890,042	$ 6,287,470	$ 414,708	$ 5,602,572	$ -	1.0660	$ -	$ 454
MERCED	$ 13,357,598	$ 10,772,130	$ 12,338,072	$ 19,948,728	$ 2,585,469	$ -	$ 2,585,469	1.1296	$ 55.21	$ 481
MID CITIES	$ 13,206,447	$ 16,416,857	$ 28,256,428	$ 30,402,103	$ -	$ -	$ -	1.0000	$ -	$ 426
MID COUNTY	$ 9,950,798	$ 10,576,618	$ 18,560,801	$ 19,586,662	$ -	$ -	$ -	1.0000	$ -	$ 426
MODESTO	$ 6,571,267	$ 6,839,513	$ 9,965,356	$ 12,665,981	$ -	$ -	$ -	1.0000	$ -	$ 426
MODOC	$ 201,498	$ 472,264	$ 1,895,375	$ 74,578	$ -	$ 1,020,797	$ -	1.0000	$ -	$ 426
MONO	$ 342,904	$ 410,120	$ 1,176,645	$ 759,494	$ -	$ 417,151	$ -	1.0000	$ -	$ 426
MONTEREY	$ 10,052,466	$ 14,603,671	$ 22,689,617	$ 27,044,295	$ -	$ -	$ -	1.0000	$ -	$ 426
MORENO VALLEY	$ 6,995,682	$ 6,701,110	$ 11,432,987	$ 12,409,674	$ 294,572	$ -	$ 294,572	1.0237	$ 10.11	$ 436
MORONGO	$ 2,685,764	$ 2,141,668	$ 4,095,910	$ 3,966,120	$ 544,096	$ 129,791	$ 414,305	1.1372	$ 58.44	$ 484

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 7-1. Severity Service Adjustment (continued)

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
SELPANAM	Current Base State SE Alloc/ADA	Count of High Cost Students	Deduct NPS C Students	NET Count of High Cost Students	Students Over The % Cut-off	# High Cost Students @ State Average	Revised 97/98 ADA	Percent High Cost ADA	SELPA's Total Cost High Cost Students	Deduct NPS C Student	Deduct Amount per Student over Allowable Ceiling	Deduct for Exceeding Ceiling Rate
MT. DIABLO	467	592	5	587	25	424	34,484	1.70%	$ 11,467,876	$ 115,650	$ 45,155	$ 297,551
N.E. ORANGE	359	347	-	347	-	365	29,716	1.17%	$ 6,857,008	$ -	$ 3,720	$ -
NAPA	490	386	45	341	49	221	17,947	1.90%	$ 7,242,715	$ 1,040,850	$ 17,809	$ 577,343
NEWPORT-MESA	421	232	4	228	-	237	19,255	1.18%	$ 4,710,043	$ 92,520	$ -	$ -
NO. ORANGE	372	445	51	394	-	596	48,448	0.81%	$ 8,795,872	$ 1,179,630	$ 1,976	$ -
NORTH COASTAL	411	1,165	24	1,141	-	1,133	92,112	1.24%	$ 21,603,790	$ 555,120	$ 16,076	$ -
NORTH INLAND	371	542	33	509	-	444	36,142	1.41%	$ 9,730,502	$ 763,290	$ 12,436	$ -
NORTH REGION	447	365	6	359	-	309	25,138	1.43%	$ 6,906,803	$ 138,780	$ -	$ -
NORWALK-LA MIRADA	377	518	1	517	-	522	42,418	1.22%	$ 10,287,327	$ 23,130	$ 5,035	$ -
OAKLAND	453	851	89	762	-	625	50,859	1.50%	$ 16,640,325	$ 2,058,570	$ 18,436	$ -
ORANGE UNIFIED	424	399	11	388	-	341	27,704	1.40%	$ 7,793,180	$ 254,430	$ 13,462	$ -
PAJARO	487	296	-	296	7	218	17,728	1.67%	$ 5,669,333	$ -	$ 13,000	$ 84,151
PASADENA	440	682	170	512	153	271	22,033	2.32%	$ 13,482,281	$ 3,932,100	$ 939	$ 1,820,198
PLACER-NEVADA	370	531	46	485	-	737	59,955	0.81%	$ 9,517,086	$ 1,063,980	$ 9,451	$ -
PLUMAS UNIFIED	386	14	-	14	-	42	3,390	0.41%	$ 272,104	$ -	$ -	$ -

	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W
SELPANAM	SELPA's Total Net Cost High Cost Student	Total Cost High Cost Student	Estimated Total Revenues	Estimated Total Rev @ State Average	SELPA High Cost In Rel To State Avg Svc	Total SELP Revenues over the State Average	Severity Supplement	Incidence Multiplier (Col Q / Col. P)	Supplement per ADA ($above 426)	Growth ADA Rate
MT. DIABLO	$ 11,009,520	$ 7,932,475	$ 16,105,438	$ 14,690,018	$ 3,077,045	$ 1,415,421	$ 1,661,625	1.2095	$ 89.23	$ 515
N.E. ORANGE	$ 6,853,287	$ 6,835,699	$ 10,657,056	$ 12,658,918	$ 17,588	$ -	$ 17,588	1.0014	$ 0.59	$ 427
NAPA	$ 5,606,713	$ 4,128,515	$ 8,799,389	$ 7,645,529	$ 1,478,198	$ 1,153,860	$ 324,338	1.1933	$ 82.36	$ 508
NEWPORT-MESA	$ 4,617,523	$ 4,429,329	$ 8,097,130	$ 8,202,600	$ 188,195	$ -	$ 188,195	1.0229	$ 9.77	$ 436
NO. ORANGE	$ 7,614,266	$ 11,144,798	$ 18,021,217	$ 20,638,865	$ -	$ -	$ -	1.0000	$ -	$ 426
NORTH COASTAL	$ 21,032,793	$ 21,189,052	$ 37,847,529	$ 39,239,652	$ -	$ -	$ -	1.0000	$ -	$ 426
NORTH INLAND	$ 8,954,776	$ 8,313,934	$ 13,420,803	$ 15,396,437	$ 640,842	$ -	$ 640,842	1.0416	$ 17.73	$ 444
NORTH REGION	$ 6,768,023	$ 5,782,677	$ 11,232,849	$ 10,708,843	$ 985,346	$ 524,005	$ 461,341	1.0920	$ 39.20	$ 465
NORWALK-LA MIRADA	$ 10,259,162	$ 9,757,639	$ 16,000,139	$ 18,070,008	$ 501,524	$ -	$ 501,524	1.0278	$ 11.82	$ 438
OAKLAND	$ 14,563,319	$ 11,699,346	$ 23,038,909	$ 21,665,823	$ 2,863,974	$ 1,373,086	$ 1,490,888	1.1322	$ 56.31	$ 482
ORANGE UNIFIED	$ 7,525,288	$ 6,373,003	$ 11,733,417	$ 11,802,057	$ 1,152,285	$ -	$ 1,152,285	1.0976	$ 41.59	$ 468
PAJARO	$ 5,572,182	$ 4,078,151	$ 8,641,333	$ 7,552,260	$ 1,494,031	$ 1,089,073	$ 404,958	1.1978	$ 84.27	$ 510
PASADENA	$ 7,729,044	$ 5,068,422	$ 9,693,507	$ 9,386,126	$ 2,660,622	$ 307,381	$ 2,353,241	1.2835	$ 120.76	$ 547
PLACER-NEVADA	$ 8,443,655	$ 13,791,867	$ 22,194,473	$ 25,540,928	$ -	$ -	$ -	1.0000	$ -	$ 426
PLUMAS UNIFIED	$ 272,104	$ 779,742	$ 1,308,476	$ 1,443,991	$ -	$ -	$ -	1.0000	$ -	$ 426

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 7-1. Severity Service Adjustment (continued)

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
SELPANAM	Current Base State SE Alloc/ADA	Count of High Cost Students	Deduct NPS C Students	NET Count of High Cost Students	Students Over The % Cut-off	# High Cost Students @ State Average	Revised 97/98 ADA	Percent High Cost ADA	SELPA's Total Cost High Cost Students	Deduct NPS C Student	Deduct Amount per Student over Allowable Ceiling	Deduct for Exceeding Ceiling Rate
POWAY UNIFIED	324	347	-	347	-	372	30,262	1.15%	$ 6,277,793	$ -	$ 21,771	$ -
PUENTE HILLS	397	533	-	533	-	498	40,521	1.32%	$ 9,606,455	$ -	$ -	$ -
RIVERSIDE COUNTY	421	2,147	194	1,953	-	2,064	167,807	1.16%	$ 42,921,046	$ 4,487,220	$ 58,972	$ -
RIVERSIDE UNIFIED	526	539	45	494	-	416	33,815	1.46%	$ 9,821,142	$ 1,040,850	$ -	$ -
SACRAMENTO CITY	407	704	33	671	-	595	48,398	1.39%	$ 13,606,204	$ 763,290	$ 6,546	$ -
SACRAMENTO County	426	669	55	614	-	754	61,316	1.00%	$ 13,349,174	$ 1,272,150	$ -	$ -
SAN BENITO	414	82	15	67	-	122	9,926	0.67%	$ 1,573,850	$ 346,950	$ 7,274	$ -
SAN BERNARDINO	390	553	33	520	-	533	43,368	1.20%	$ 10,418,114	$ 763,290	$ 387	$ -
SAN DIEGO CITY	499	3,183	22	3,161	1,068	1,579	128,414	2.46%	$ 58,669,816	$ 508,860	$ 71,095	$ 12,714,933
SAN FRANCISCO	604	1,010	40	970	18	719	58,431	1.66%	$ 18,972,121	$ 925,200	$ 7,505	$ 210,850
SAN JOAQUIN	363	273	23	250	-	553	44,994	0.56%	$ 4,778,598	$ 531,990	$ -	$ -
SAN JUAN UNIFIED	459	704	181	523	-	566	46,018	1.14%	$ 12,612,280	$ 4,186,530	$ -	$ -
SAN LUIS OBISPO	418	265	-	265	-	424	34,492	0.77%	$ 4,696,496	$ -	$ 11,679	$ -
SAN MATEO	459	921	3	918	-	1,086	88,281	1.04%	$ 16,415,818	$ 69,390	$ -	$ -
SANTA ANA	387	506	3	503	-	622	50,599	0.99%	$ 9,918,101	$ 69,390	$ 20,683	$ -

SELPANAM	N SELPA's Total Net Cost High Cost Student	O Total Cost High Cost Student	P Estimated Total Revenues	Q Estimated Total Rev @ State Average	R SELPA High Cost In Rel To State Avg Svc	S Total SELP Revenues over the State Average	T Severity Supplement	U Incidence Multiplier (Col Q / Col. P)	V Supplement per ADA ($above 426)	W Growth ADA Rate
POWAY UNIFIED	$ 6,256,022	$ 6,961,373	$ 9,800,770	$ 12,891,650	$ -	$ -	$ -	1.0000	$ -	$ 426
PUENTE HILLS	$ 9,606,455	$ 9,321,267	$ 16,075,747	$ 17,261,899	$ 285,188	$ -	$ 285,188	1.0165	$ 7.04	$ 433
RIVERSIDE COUNTY	$ 38,374,854	$ 38,601,698	$ 70,728,131	$ 71,485,842	$ -	$ -	$ -	1.0000	$ -	$ 426
RIVERSIDE UNIFIED	$ 8,780,292	$ 7,778,670	$ 17,800,921	$ 14,405,190	$ 1,001,622	$ 3,395,731	$ -	1.0695	$ -	$ 456
SACRAMENTO CITY	$ 12,836,368	$ 11,133,383	$ 19,696,942	$ 20,617,727	$ 1,702,984	$ -	$ 1,702,984	1.0826	$ 35.19	$ 461
SACRAMENTO county	$ 12,077,024	$ 14,104,918	$ 26,145,459	$ 26,120,663	$ -	$ 24,797	$ -	1.0000	$ -	$ 426
SAN BENITO	$ 1,219,626	$ 2,283,446	$ 4,113,601	$ 4,228,676	$ -	$ -	$ -	1.0000	$ -	$ 426
SAN BERNARDINO	$ 9,654,436	$ 9,976,095	$ 16,914,189	$ 18,474,564	$ -	$ -	$ -	1.0000	$ -	$ 426
SAN DIEGO CITY	$ 45,374,928	$ 29,539,831	$ 64,088,169	$ 54,704,321	$ 15,835,097	$ 9,383,847	$ 6,451,250	1.2895	$ 123.31	$ 549
SAN FRANCISCO	$ 17,828,566	$ 13,441,183	$ 35,293,372	$ 24,891,504	$ 4,387,382	$ 10,401,868	$ -	1.1763	$ -	$ 501
SAN JOAQUIN	$ 4,246,608	$ 10,350,145	$ 16,312,530	$ 19,167,261	$ -	$ -	$ -	1.0000	$ -	$ 426
SAN JUAN UNIFIED	$ 8,425,750	$ 10,585,886	$ 21,140,623	$ 19,603,826	$ -	$ 1,536,797	$ -	1.0000	$ -	$ 426
SAN LUIS OBISPO	$ 4,684,818	$ 7,934,308	$ 14,417,380	$ 14,693,413	$ -	$ -	$ -	1.0000	$ -	$ 426
SAN MATEO	$ 16,346,428	$ 20,307,853	$ 40,502,830	$ 37,607,774	$ -	$ 2,895,055	$ -	1.0000	$ -	$ 426
SANTA ANA	$ 9,828,028	$ 11,639,651	$ 19,560,264	$ 21,555,276	$ -	$ -	$ -	1.0000	$ -	$ 426

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 7-1. Severity Service Adjustment (continued)

A SELPANAM	B Current Base State SE Alloc/ADA	C Count of High Cost Students	D Deduct NPS C Students	E NET Count of High Cost Students	F Students Over The % Cut-off	G # High Cost Students @ State Average	H Revised 97/98 ADA	I Percent High Cost ADA	J SELPA's Total Cost High Cost Students	K Deduct NPS C Student	L Deduct Amount per Student over Allowable Ceiling	M Deduct for Exceeding Ceiling Rate
SANTA BARBARA	433	880	103	777	-	742	60,372	1.29%	$ 15,253,042	$ 2,382,390	$ 9,451	$ -
SANTA CLARA AREA I	455	185	63	122	-	249	20,224	0.60%	$ 3,575,625	$ 1,457,190	$ -	$ -
SANTA CLARA AREA II	379	239	-	239	-	358	29,148	0.82%	$ 4,286,832	$ -	$ -	$ -
SANTA CLARA AREA IV	404	241	-	241	-	387	31,442	0.77%	$ 4,106,591	$ -	$ 1,074	$ -
SANTA CLARA AREA V	430	810	-	810	-	1,141	92,788	0.87%	$ 14,354,841	$ -	$ -	$ -
SANTA CLARA AREA VI	405	163	-	163	-	213	17,307	0.94%	$ 2,686,239	$ -	$ -	$ -
SANTA CLARA AREA VII	478	114	-	114	-	172	13,949	0.82%	$ 2,041,711	$ -	$ -	$ -
SANTA CLARA III	610	637	-	637	49	444	36,086	1.77%	$ 11,872,021	$ -	$ 1,120	$ 581,943
SANTA CLARITA	386	359	-	359	-	418	33,964	1.06%	$ 6,632,304	$ -	$ 4,501	$ -
SANTA CRUZ	545	240	8	232	-	237	19,272	1.20%	$ 4,414,972	$ 185,040	$ -	$ -
SHASTA COUNTY	465	374	56	318	-	356	28,923	1.10%	$ 6,817,180	$ 1,295,280	$ -	$ -
SIERRA COUNTY	931	8	-	8	-	11	900	0.89%	$ 121,902	$ -	$ -	$ -
SISKIYOU COUNTY	599	129	-	129	2	95	7,764	1.66%	$ 2,195,144	$ -	$ -	$ 29,358
SOLANO COUNTY	431	548	22	526	-	583	47,435	1.11%	$ 10,168,864	$ 508,860	$ -	$ -
SONOMA COUNTY	523	982	162	820	-	830	67,461	1.22%	$ 18,413,230	$ 3,747,060	$ 22,442	$ -

SELPANAM	N SELPA's Total Net Cost High Cost Student	O Total Cost High Cost Student	P Estimated Total Revenues	Q Estimated Total Rev @ State Average	R SELPA High Cost In Rel To State Avg Svc	S Total SELP Revenues over the State Average	T Severity Supplement	U Incidence Multiplier (Col Q / Col. P)	V Supplement per ADA ($above 426)	W Growth ADA Rate
SANTA BARBARA	$ 12,861,201	$ 13,887,723	$ 26,120,122	$ 25,718,442	$ -	$ 401,680	$ -	1.0000	$ -	$ 426
SANTA CLARA AREA I	$ 2,118,435	$ 4,652,356	$ 9,196,298	$ 8,615,620	$ -	$ 580,678	$ -	1.0000	$ -	$ 426
SANTA CLARA AREA II	$ 4,286,832	$ 6,705,117	$ 11,052,087	$ 12,417,095	$ -	$ -	$ -	1.0000	$ -	$ 426
SANTA CLARA AREA IV	$ 4,105,516	$ 7,232,843	$ 12,690,206	$ 13,394,381	$ -	$ -	$ -	1.0000	$ -	$ 426
SANTA CLARA AREA V	$ 14,354,841	$ 21,344,517	$ 39,873,832	$ 39,527,556	$ -	$ 346,276	$ -	1.0000	$ -	$ 426
SANTA CLARA AREA VI	$ 2,686,239	$ 3,981,214	$ 7,009,246	$ 7,372,744	$ -	$ -	$ -	1.0000	$ -	$ 426
SANTA CLARA AREA VII	$ 2,041,711	$ 3,208,720	$ 6,670,212	$ 5,942,176	$ -	$ 728,036	$ -	1.0000	$ -	$ 426
SANTA CLARA III	$ 11,288,957	$ 8,300,993	$ 22,007,653	$ 15,372,470	$ 2,987,965	$ 6,635,183	$ -	1.1944	$ -	$ 509
SANTA CLARITA	$ 6,627,803	$ 7,812,872	$ 13,125,557	$ 14,468,528	$ -	$ -	$ -	1.0000	$ -	$ 426
SANTA CRUZ	$ 4,229,932	$ 4,433,306	$ 10,509,342	$ 8,209,966	$ -	$ 2,299,377	$ -	1.0000	$ -	$ 426
SHASTA COUNTY	$ 5,521,900	$ 6,653,260	$ 13,445,641	$ 12,321,062	$ -	$ 1,124,580	$ -	1.0000	$ -	$ 426
SIERRA COUNTY	$ 121,902	$ 206,986	$ 837,457	$ 83,315	$ -	$ 454,142	$ -	1.0000	$ -	$ 426
SISKIYOU COUNTY	$ 2,165,786	$ 1,785,977	$ 4,648,058	$ 3,307,421	$ 379,809	$ 1,340,636	$ -	1.1148	$ -	$ 475
SOLANO COUNTY	$ 9,660,004	$ 10,911,654	$ 20,443,783	$ 20,207,110	$ -	$ 236,673	$ -	1.0000	$ -	$ 426
SONOMA COUNTY	$ 14,643,728	$ 15,518,522	$ 35,298,338	$ 28,738,493	$ -	$ 6,559,845	$ -	1.0000	$ -	$ 426

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 7-1. Severity Service Adjustment (continued)

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
SELPANAM	Current Base State SE Alloc/ADA	Count of High Cost Students	Deduct NPS C Students	NET Count of High Cost Students	Students Over The % Cut-off	# High Cost Students @ State Average	Revised 97/98 ADA	Percent High Cost ADA	SELPA's Total Cost High Cost Students	Deduct NPS C Student	Deduct Amount per Student over Allowable Ceiling	Deduct for Exceeding Ceiling Rate
SOUTH BAY	426	1,038	17	1,021	-	879	71,474	1.43%	$ 20,516,894	$ 393,210		$ -
SO. ORANGE	332	797	-	797	-	896	72,895	1.09%	$ 14,995,781	$ -	$ 92,710	$ -
SOUTHWEST	450	1,337	39	1,298	-	1,122	91,258	1.42%	$ 24,185,507	$ 902,070	$ 92,710	$ -
STANISLAUS COUNTY	407	696	63	633	-	700	56,964	1.11%	$ 12,786,705	$ 1,457,190	$ 21,822	$ -
STOCKTON CITY	423	439	79	360	-	415	33,764	1.07%	$ 7,858,931	$ 1,827,270	$ 43,403	$ -
SUTTER COUNTY	422	108	-	108	-	180	14,630	0.74%	$ 2,027,781	$ -	$ -	$ -
TAHOE-ALPINE	392	75	-	75	-	68	5,539	1.35%	$ 1,493,264	$ -	$ 3,167	$ -
TEHAMA COUNTY	468	65	-	65	-	129	10,463	0.62%	$ 1,347,355	$ -	$ 12,151	$ -
TRI-CITIES	386	353	6	347	-	271	22,025	1.58%	$ 6,826,697	$ 138,780	$ 13,686	$ -
TRI-COUNTY	644	236	15	221	-	235	19,108	1.16%	$ 4,840,852	$ 346,950	$ -	$ -
TRINITY COUNTY	751	3	-	3	-	27	2,226	0.13%	$ 57,459	$ -	$ -	$ -
TRI-VALLEY	352	313	-	313	-	342	27,834	1.12%	$ 5,918,788	$ -	$ -	$ -
TULARE COUNTY	408	334	-	334	-	973	79,153	0.42%	$ 6,484,536	$ -	$ 10,861	$ -
TUSTIN UNIFIED	331	150	1	149	-	181	14,694	1.01%	$ 3,094,618	$ 23,130	$ -	$ -
VALLEJO CITY	437	328	14	314	17	224	18,223	1.72%	$ 6,176,383	$ 323,820	$ 5,437	$ 202,538

N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W
SELPA's Total Net Cost High Cost Student	Total Cost High Cost Student	Estimated Total Revenues	Estimated Total Rev @ State Average	SELPA High Cost In Rel To State Avg Svc	Total SELP Revenues over the State Average	Severity Supplement	Incidence Multiplier (Col Q / Col. P)	Supplement per ADA (Above 426)	Growth ADA Rate
SELPANAM									
SOUTH BAY	$ 20,101,215	$ 16,441,551	$ 30,432,229	$ 30,447,835	$ 3,659,664	$ -	$ 3,659,664	1.1202	$ 51.20	$ 477
SO. ORANGE	$ 14,903,071	$ 16,768,446	$ 24,236,080	$ 31,053,206	$ -	$ -	$ -	1.0000	$ -	$ 426
SOUTHWEST	$ 23,190,726	$ 20,992,656	$ 41,062,197	$ 38,875,951	$ 2,198,070	$ 2,186,246	$ 11,823	1.0565	$ 24.09	$ 450
STANISLAUS COUNTY	$ 11,307,693	$ 13,103,755	$ 23,196,856	$ 24,266,626	$ -	$ -	$ -	1.0000	$ -	$ 426
STOCKTON CITY	$ 5,988,258	$ 7,766,968	$ 14,282,375	$ 14,383,519	$ -	$ -	$ -	1.0000	$ -	$ 426
SUTTER COUNTY	$ 2,027,781	$ 3,365,428	$ 6,170,582	$ 6,232,380	$ -	$ -	$ -	1.0000	$ -	$ 426
TAHOE-ALPINE	$ 1,490,097	$ 1,274,191	$ 2,173,479	$ 2,359,652	$ 215,907	$ -	$ 215,907	1.0915	$ 38.98	$ 465
TEHAMA COUNTY	$ 1,335,204	$ 2,406,858	$ 4,892,301	$ 4,457,221	$ -	$ 435,080	$ -	1.0000	$ -	$ 426
TRI-CITIES	$ 6,674,231	$ 5,066,506	$ 8,503,677	$ 9,382,578	$ 1,607,725	$ -	$ 1,607,725	1.1714	$ 73.00	$ 499
TRI-COUNTY	$ 4,493,902	$ 4,395,530	$ 12,299,595	$ 8,140,008	$ 98,373	$ 4,159,587	$ -	1.0121	$ -	$ 431
TRINITY COUNTY	$ 57,459	$ 511,980	$ 1,671,761	$ 48,127	$ -	$ 723,634	$ -	1.0000	$ -	$ 426
TRI-VALLEY	$ 5,918,788	$ 6,402,737	$ 9,805,055	$ 11,857,122	$ -	$ -	$ -	1.0000	$ -	$ 426
TULARE COUNTY	$ 6,473,675	$ 18,208,060	$ 32,278,206	$ 33,719,204	$ -	$ -	$ -	1.0000	$ -	$ 426
TUSTIN UNIFIED	$ 3,071,488	$ 3,380,233	$ 4,863,904	$ 6,259,797	$ -	$ -	$ -	1.0000	$ -	$ 426
VALLEJO CITY	$ 5,644,589	$ 4,191,839	$ 7,966,169	$ 7,762,798	$ 1,452,749	$ 203,372	$ 1,249,378	1.1871	$ 79.72	$ 506

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 7-1. Severity Service Adjustment (continued)

A SELPANAM	B Current Base State SE Alloc/ADA	C Count of High Cost Students	D Deduct NPS C. Students	E NET Count of High Cost Students	F Students Over The % Cut-off	G # High Cost Students @ State Average	H Revised 97/98 ADA	I Percent High Cost ADA	J SELPA's Total Cost High Cost Students	K Deduct NPS C. Student	L Deduct Amount per Student over Allowable Ceiling	M Deduct for Exceeding Ceiling Rate
VENTURA	378	1,522	78	1,444	-	1,664	135,347	1.07%	$ 29,218,072	$ 1,804,140	$ -	$ -
W. CONTRA COSTA	484	499	46	453	-	380	30,876	1.47%	$ 10,026,889	$ 1,063,980	$ 35,015	$ -
W. ORANGE	486	727	-	727	-	536	43,613	1.62%	$ 13,044,032	$ -	$ 13,257	$ -
W. SAN GABRIEL	392	1,239	42	997	-	1,181	96,011	1.04%	$ 18,331,199	$ 971,460	$ 5,878	$ -
WASHTOWNSHIP	408	628	15	613	-	621	50,519	1.21%	$ 11,984,334	$ 346,950	$ 5,455	$ -
WEST END	397	808	11	797	-	1,265	102,874	0.77%	$ 14,467,609	$ 254,430	$ 7,493	$ -
WHITTIER	403	683	12	671	-	612	49,804	1.35%	$ 12,414,591	$ 277,560	$ 15,869	$ -
YOLO COUNTY	443	353	22	331	-	305	24,840	1.33%	$ 6,532,683	$ 508,860	$ 3,259	$ -
YUBA COUNTY	404	128	-	128	-	153	12,421	1.03%	$ 2,378,269	$ -	$ -	$ -
TOTALS	426	69,968	3,664	66,304	2,138	66,304	5,391,898	1.23%	1,324,701,129	84,748,320	$ 1,431,957	$ 25,447,349

SELPANAM	N SELPA's Total Net Cost High Cost Student	O Total Cost High Cost Student	P Estimated Total Revenues	Q Estimated Total Rev @ State Average	R SELPA High Cost In Rel To State Avg Svc	S Total SELP Revenues over the State Average	T Severity Supplement	U Incidence Multiplier (Col Q / Col. P)	V Supplement per ADA ($above 426)	W Growth ADA Rate
VENTURA	$ 27,413,932	$ 31,134,674	$ 51,183,666	$ 57,657,784	$ -	$ -	$ -	1.0000	$ -	$ 426
W. CONTRA COSTA	$ 8,927,894	$ 7,422,527	$ 14,939,986	$ 3,153,014	$ 1,825,387	$ 1,786,972	$ 38,415	1.1388	$ 59.12	$ 485
W. ORANGE	$ 13,030,775	$ 10,232,545	$ 21,208,907	$ 18,579,104	$ 2,998,230	$ 2,629,803	$ 368,427	1.1614	$ 68.75	$ 495
W. SAN GABRIEL	$ 17,353,862	$ 22,285,986	$ 37,637,150	$ 40,900,669	$ -	$ -	$ -	1.0000	$ -	$ 426
WASHTOWNSHIP	$ 11,631,929	$ 11,621,096	$ 20,627,591	$ 21,520,915	$ 10,833	$ -	$ 10,833	1.0005	$ 0.21	$ 426
WEST END	$ 14,205,686	$ 23,664,799	$ 40,855,058	$ 43,824,448	$ -	$ -	$ -	1.0000	$ -	$ 426
WHITTIER	$ 12,121,362	$ 11,456,134	$ 20,079,642	$ 21,216,351	$ 664,527	$ -	$ 664,527	1.0313	$ 13.34	$ 439
YOLO COUNTY	$ 6,220,563	$ 5,714,227	$ 11,010,529	$ 10,581,712	$ 306,536	$ 428,817	$ -	1.0290	$ -	$ 438
YUBA COUNTY	$ 2,378,269	$ 2,857,379	$ 5,014,219	$ 5,291,533	$ -	$ -	$ -	1.0000	$ -	$ 426
TOTALS	$ 1,213,073,504			$ 2,296,948,378	$ 133,454,723		$ 57,446,825			

Average SE Cost per Student	$6416.62
Standard Deviation	$5487.09
High Cost Cut-off	$11923.71
State Average % of High Cost Students	1.23%
Ceiling % for High Cost Students	1.63%
Total State Cost for Severity Service Adjustment	$57,446,825

Number of High Cost Students	66,304
Average SE Cost Per High Cost Student	$18,706.73
Standard Deviation	$5,000.04
Lowest Cost of High Cost Students	$11,914.72
Highest Cost of High Cost Students	$51,058.51
High Cost Ceiling	$36,000.00

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

References

Algozzine, B., & Korinek, L. (1985). Where is special education for students with high prevalence handicaps going? *Exceptional Children, 51*, 388-394.

Algozzine, B., & Ysseldyke, J. E. (1987). In defense of different numbers. *Remedial and Special Education, 8* (2), 53-56.

Algozzine, B., Ysseldyke, J. E., & Christensen, S. (1983). Ana analysis of the incidence of special education class placement: The masses are burgeoning. *Journal of Special Education, 17*, 141-147.

California Assembly Bill 602, Chapter 854, Statutes of 1997, approved and filed October 10, 1997.

Chaikund, S., Danielson, L.C., & Brauen, M.L. (1993). What do we know about the costs of special education? A selected review. *Journal of Special Education.* 26(4), 344-79.

Fleiss, J.L. (1973). *Statistical Methods for Rates and Proportions.* New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Gelb, S. A., & Mizokawa, D. T. (1986). Special education and social structure: the commonality of "exceptionality." *American Educational Research Journal, 23*(4), 543-557.

Gerber, M. M. (1984). The Department of Education's Sixth Annual Report to Congress on P. L. 94-142: Is Congress getting the full story? *Exceptional Children, 51*, 209-224.

Gerber, M. M., & Levine-Donnerstein, D. (1989). Educating all children: Ten years later. *Exceptional Children, 56*, 17-27.

Hallahan, D. P., Keller, C. E., & Ball, D. W. (1986). A comparison of prevalence rate variability from state to state for each of the categories of special education. *Remedial and Special Education, 7*(2), 8-14.

Hartman, W.T. (1983). Projecting special education costs. J.G Chambers and W.T. Hartman (Eds.), *Special Education Policies Their History, Implementation, and Finance* (pp. 241-288)

Keller, C. E., Ball, D. W., & Hallahan, D. P. (1987). Questioning the defense of different numbers: A reply to Algozzine and Ysseldyke. *Remedial and Special Education, 8*(2), 57-59.

Kennedy, S. (1997). CSF/CEC support helps pass revolutionary reform measure. *CSF/CEC Journal,* University of San Diego, pp. 4-5, 20.

Legislative Analyst's Office, California Departments of Education and Finance. (1995). *New Funding Model of Special Education: Final Report*.

Nelson, F. H. (1982). A simultaneous equation model of the provision of services to handicapped children at the school district level. *American Educational Research Journal, 29*(4), 579-597.

Noel, M. M., & Fuller, B. C. (1985). The social policy construction of special education: The impact of state characteristics on identification and integration of handicapped children. *Remedial and Special Education, 6*(3), 27-35.

Singer, J. D., Butler, J. A., Palfrey, J. S., & Walker, D. K. (1986). Characteristics of special education placements: Findings from probability samples in five metropolitan school districts. *Journal of Special Education, 20*(3), 319-337.

Singer, J. D., Palfrey, J. S., Butler, J. A., & Walker, D. K. (1989). Variation in special education classification across school districts: How does where you live affect what you are labeled. *American Educational Research Journal, 26*(2), 261-81.

Appendix Table of Contents

A-1 Data Sources
A-2 CASEMIS and Personnel Crosswalk with Teacher and Aide Salary
A-3 Alignment of Districts with SELPAs
A-4 Chapter 3 Technical Notes
A-5 Chapter 4 Technical Notes (Final Regression Models)

A-6 Allocation of Teacher Aides to Special Day Class and Resource Specialist Programs
A-7 Special Day Class Personnel and Aide Multipliers by Disability Class Size
A-8 Calculation of NPS/LCI Group C Deduction
A-9 Salary and Benefit Multiplier for Classified and Certificated Personnel
A-10 Nonpersonnel Multiplier

A-11 Administration Multiplier
A-12 Administration Multiplier for NPS
A-13 Formula for Determining Cost of Variable "5 or More DIS"
A-14 Formula for Calculating Cost of Special Day Class Placement
A-15 Formula for Calculating Cost of Resource Specialist Program Placement

A-16 Formula for Calculating Cost of Designated Instructional Services
A-17 Formula for Determining Nonpublic School Cost per Student
A-18 SELPA Director's Interview Protocol
A-19 SELPA Directors Interviewed
A-20 Source of SELPA ADA Used in Analysis

A-21 Source of SELPA AB 602 Funding Rates Used in Analysis
A-22 CASEMIS Exemptions

Appendix A-1

Data Sources

Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), October 1996, California Department of Education

California Basic Educational Data System (CBEDS), 1996-97, California Department of Education

California Special Education Management Information System (CASEMIS), October 1997, California Department of Education

Common Core Data Agency, California 1995, National Center for Education Statistics

Free and Reduced Lunch, October 1996, California Department of Education

J-50 Special Education Entitlement Forms, 1996-97, California Department of Education

J-200, 1996-97 , California Department of Education

J-385, 1996-97, California Department of Education

Special Education Personnel Data Report, 1996-97, California Department of Education

Appendix A-2

CASEMIS and Personnel Files Crosswalk with Teacher and Aide Salary

DIS Code	CASEMIS Description	Code	Personnel Description	Salary + Benefits
50	Language and Speech	06	Language and Speech Specialist	$50,400
51	Home and Hospital	05	Home and/or Hospital Instructor	$50,400
52	Adapted Physical Education	12	Adapted P.E. Specialist	$50,400
64	Recreational Services, Includes Therapeutic Recreation	10	Recreation Therapist	
53	Audiological Services	22	Audiologist	$50,400
54	Individual Counseling	15	Counselor	$50,400*1.1
55	Group Counseling	16	School Social Worker	
56	Guidance Services			
60	Parent Counseling			
	Social Work Services			
68	Psychological Services			
57	Occupational Therapy	08	Occupational Therapist	$50,400
58	Physical Therapy	09	Physical Therapist	$50,400
59	Orientation and Mobility	11	Mobility Specialist	$50,400
63	Vocational Ed. Training	13	Vocational Ed. Specialist	$50,400
66	Vision Services	18	Other Certificated DIS Provider	$50,400
67	Specialized Driver Training	19	Other Licensed Personnel	
71	Specialized Services for Low Incidence Disabilities	23	Other Diagnostic Staff	
		25	Other Professional Staff	
72	Health and Nursing - Specialized Physical Health Care Services			
83	Itinerant Services			
86	Deaf and Hard of Hearing Services			

DIS Code	CASEMIS Description	Code	Personnel Description	Salary
73	Health and Nursing - Other Services \	17	Classified DIS Provider	$12,000
74	Interpreter Services \			
75	Educ. Tech. Services \			
76	Behavior Management Services \			
77	Assistive Services |			
78	Braille Transcription /			
79	Reader Services /			
80	Note Taking Services /			
84	Adult Transition Services \	14	Work-Study Coordinator	$50,400
85	Vocational Counseling /			
Administration		20	Program Specialist	$50,400 * 1.4
		24	Supervisor / Administrator	
		25	Psychologist	
		26	Other Non-professional Staff	$12,000
Resource Specialist Program				
RSP		03	Resource Specialist	$50,400
65	Individual and Small Group Instruction	J50	Aides	
Special Day Class				
SDC		04	SDC Teacher	$50,400
81	Early Childhood Education	02	All Sp. Ed. Teachers for Ages 3-5	
		J50	Aides	

Non-Public Schools

	J50		*CASEMIS NPS students*		*State NPS average/child*
NPS	=	$266,140,550	/ 12,370	=	$21,515

Exemptions

1. All students aged 0-2 were removed from CASEMIS for this analysis. Any student born after April 1, 1994 was not included in the analysis. 5130 students were removed from the analysis.
2. The LA County Court Schools (SELPA 1901) was not included in the analysis.
3. The state operated programs California State Special Schools (SELPA 7100), California Youth Authority (SELPA 7200), and California Dept. of Dev. Services (SELPA 7300) were not included in the analysis.

CA Dept. of Education
Form R-30 SE (12-95)
Page 1 of 1 (SELPA/SOP)

SELPA/SOP Code: _____

SPECIAL EDUCATION PERSONNEL DATA REPORT : 1995-96

SELPA/SOP REPORT

•••••••••• NOTE: Column D is a subset of Column A and Column E is a subset of Column B. ••••••••••

CATEGORY OF PERSONNEL	LINE	EMPLOY/CONTRACT		VACANT POSITIONS (C)	NEW HIRES IN 1995-96		ROW TOTAL (F)
		FULLY CERTIFIED (A)	NOT FULLY CERTIFIED (B)		FULLY CERTIFIED (D)	NOT FULLY CERTIFIED (E)	
ALL SP. ED. TEACHERS FOR AGES 0-2	01						
ALL SP. ED. TEACHERS FOR AGES 3-5	02						
SP. ED. TEACHERS / INSTRUCTORS FOR AGES 6-22							
* Resource Specialist	03						
* SDC Teacher	04						
* Home and/or Hospital Instructor	05						
* Language and Speech Specialist	06						
* Teacher Aide	07						
OTHER SP. ED. RELATED SERVICES PERSONNEL							
* Occupational Therapist	08						
* Physical Therapist	09						
* Recreation Therapist	10						
* Mobility Specialist	11						
* Adapted P.E. Specialist	12						
* Vocational Education Specialist	13						
* Work-Study Coordinator	14						
* Counselor	15						
* School Social Worker	16						
* Classified DIS Provider	17						
* Other Certificated DIS Provider	18						
* Other Licensed Personnel	19						
DIAGNOSTIC/ ADMINISTRATIVE / SUPPORT STAFF							
* Program Specialist	20						
* Psychologist	21						
* Audiologist	22						
* Other Diagnostic Staff	23						
* Supervisor / Administrator	24						
* Other Professional Staff	25						
* Other Non-professional Staff	26						
TOTAL (Lines 01-26)	27						

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Field Description and Codes

13 Community College
14 Other Postsecondary
15 Ungraded
16 Infant
17 Preschool
18 Kindergarten

Requires Intensive Services

T or Y True or Yes, if the student requires intensive services
F or N False or No, if not or leave blank

Total Number of Designated Instruction or Related Services Received by the Student that are Paid for by the SELPA (if any)

(NN)

A DIS Service Received by the Student that is Paid for by the SELPA (if any)

50 Language and Speech
51 Home and Hospital
52 Adapted Physical Education
53 Audiological Services
54 Individual Counseling
55 Group Counseling
56 Guidance Services
57 Occupational Therapy
58 Physical Therapy
59 Orientation and Mobility
60 Parent Counseling
61 (Do Not Use)
62 Social Work Services
63 Voc. Ed. Training
64 Recreation Services, Includes Therapeutic Recreation
65 Individual and Small Group Instruction
66 Vision Services
67 Specialized Driver Training
68 Psychological Services
69 (Do Not Use)
70 (Do Not Use)
71 Specialized Services for Low Incidence Disabilities
72 Health and Nursing - Specialized Physical Health Care Services
73 Health and Nursing - Other Services
74 Interpreter Services
75 Educ. Tech. Services
76 Behavior Management Services
77 Assistive Services
78 Braille Transcription
79 Reader Services
80 Note Taking Services
81 Early Childhood Education
82 (Do Not Use)
83 Itinerant Services
84 Adult Transition Services
85 Vocational Counseling
86 Deaf and Hard of Hearing Services

Appendix A-3

Alignment of Districts with SELPAs
Source: California Department of Education

District Name	District Code	SELPA Name	SELPA Code
EL DORADO UNION HIGH	61853	EL DORADO	901
GOLD OAK UNION ELEMENTARY	61879	EL DORADO	901
GOLD TRAIL UNION ELEMENTARY	61887	EL DORADO	901
INDIAN DIGGINGS ELEMENTARY	61895	EL DORADO	901
LATROBE ELEMENTARY	61911	EL DORADO	901
MOTHER LODE UNION ELEMENTARY	61929	EL DORADO	901
PIONEER UNION ELEMENTARY	61945	EL DORADO	901
PLACERVILLE UNION ELEMENTARY	61952	EL DORADO	901
POLLOCK PINES ELEMENTARY	61960	EL DORADO	901
RESCUE UNION ELEMENTARY	61978	EL DORADO	901
SILVER FORK ELEMENTARY	61986	EL DORADO	901
ELK GROVE UNIFIED	67314	ELK GROVE	3411
FONTANA UNIFIED	67710	FONTANA UNIFIED	3613
BURBANK UNIFIED	64337	FOOTHILL	1912
GLENDALE UNIFIED	64568	FOOTHILL	1912
LA CANADA UNIFIED	64659	FOOTHILL	1912
*FRESNO CO. OFFICE OF EDUCATIO	10108	FRESNO COUNTY	1001
ALVINA ELEMENTARY	61994	FRESNO COUNTY	1001
AMERICAN UNION ELEMENTARY	62000	FRESNO COUNTY	1001
BIG CREEK ELEMENTARY	62026	FRESNO COUNTY	1001
BURREL UNION ELEMENTARY	62042	FRESNO COUNTY	1001
CARUTHERS UNION ELEMENTARY	62067	FRESNO COUNTY	1001
CARUTHERS UNION HIGH	62075	FRESNO COUNTY	1001
CENTRAL UNIFIED	73965	FRESNO COUNTY	1001
CLAY JOINT ELEMENTARY	62109	FRESNO COUNTY	1001
COAL INGA/HURON JOINT UNIFIED	62125	FRESNO COUNTY	1001
FIREBAUGH-LAS DELTAS UNIFIED	73809	FRESNO COUNTY	1001
FOWLER UNIFIED	62158	FRESNO COUNTY	1001
GOLDEN PLAINS UNIFIED	75234	FRESNO COUNTY	1001
KERMAN UNIFIED	73999	FRESNO COUNTY	1001
KINGS CANYON JOINT UNIFIED	62265	FRESNO COUNTY	1001
KINGSBURG JOINT UNION ELEMENTA	62240	FRESNO COUNTY	1001
KINGSBURG JOINT UNION HIGH	62257	FRESNO COUNTY	1001
LATON JOINT UNIFIED	62281	FRESNO COUNTY	1001
MENDOTA UNIFIED	75127	FRESNO COUNTY	1001
MONROE ELEMENTARY	62323	FRESNO COUNTY	1001
ORANGE CENTER ELEMENTARY	62331	FRESNO COUNTY	1001
PACIFIC UNION ELEMENTARY	62356	FRESNO COUNTY	1001
PARLIER UNIFIED	62364	FRESNO COUNTY	1001
PINE RIDGE ELEMENTARY	62372	FRESNO COUNTY	1001
RAISIN CITY ELEMENTARY	62380	FRESNO COUNTY	1001
RIVERDALE JOINT UNIFIED	75408	FRESNO COUNTY	1001
SANGER UNIFIED	62414	FRESNO COUNTY	1001
SELMA UNIFIED	62430	FRESNO COUNTY	1001
SIERRA UNIFIED	75275	FRESNO COUNTY	1001
WASHINGTON COLONY ELEMENTARY	62513	FRESNO COUNTY	1001
WASHINGTON UNION HIGH	62521	FRESNO COUNTY	1001
WEST FRESNO ELEMENTARY	62174	FRESNO COUNTY	1001
WEST PARK ELEMENTARY	62539	FRESNO COUNTY	1001
WESTS IDE ELEMENTARY	62547	FRESNO COUNTY	1001
FRESNO UNIFIED	62166	FRESNO UNIFIED	1011
GARDEN GROVE UNIFIED	66522	GARDEN GROVE	3012

Appendix A-3

Alignment of Districts with SELPAs
Source: California Department of Education

District Name	District Code	SELPA Name	SELPA Code
*GLENN CO. OFFICE OF EDUCATION	10116	GLENN COUNTY	1100
CAPAY JOINT UNION ELEMENTARY	62554	GLENN COUNTY	1100
HAMILTON UNION ELEMENTARY	62570	GLENN COUNTY	1100
HAMILTON UNION HIGH	62588	GLENN COUNTY	1100
LAKE ELEMENTARY	62596	GLENN COUNTY	1100
ORLAND JOINT UNION ELEMENTARY	62612	GLENN COUNTY	1100
ORLAND JOINT UNION HIGH	62620	GLENN COUNTY	1100
PLAZA ELEMENTARY	62638	GLENN COUNTY	1100
PRINCETON JOINT UNIFIED	62646	GLENN COUNTY	1100
STONY CREEK JOINT UNIFIED	62653	GLENN COUNTY	1100
WILLOWS UNIFIED	62661	GLENN COUNTY	1100
ANAHEIM UNION HIGH	66431	GREATER ANAHEIM	3013
CENTRAL IA ELEMENTARY	66472	GREATER ANAHEIM	3013
CYPRESS ELEMENTARY	66480	GREATER ANAHEIM	3013
LOS ALAMITOS UNIFIED	73924	GREATER ANAHEIM	3013
MAGNOLIA ELEMENTARY	66589	GREATER ANAHEIM	3013
SAVANNA ELEMENTARY	66696	GREATER ANAHEIM	3013
*DEL NORTE CO. OFFICE OF EDUCA	10082	HUMB - DEL NORTE	1200
*HUMBOLDT CO. OFFICE OF EDUCAT	10124	HUMB - DEL NORTE	1200
ARCATA ELEMENTARY	62679	HUMB - DEL NORTE	1200
BIG LAGOON UNION ELEMENTARY	62695	HUMB - DEL NORTE	1200
BLUE LAKE UNION ELEMENTARY	62703	HUMB - DEL NORTE	1200
BRIDGEVILLE ELEMENTARY	62729	HUMB - DEL NORTE	1200
CUDDEBACK UNION ELEMENTARY	62737	HUMB - DEL NORTE	1200
CUTTEN ELEMENTARY	62745	HUMB - DEL NORTE	1200
DEL NORTE COUNTY UNIFIED	61820	HUMB - DEL NORTE	1200
EUREKA CITY ELEMENTARY	62752	HUMB - DEL NORTE	1200
EUREKA CITY HIGH	62760	HUMB - DEL NORTE	1200
FERNDALE UNIFIED	75374	HUMB - DEL NORTE	1200
FIELDBROOK ELEMENTARY	62794	HUMB - DEL NORTE	1200
FORTUNA UNION ELEMENTARY	62802	HUMB - DEL NORTE	1200
FORTUNA UNION HIGH	62810	HUMB - DEL NORTE	1200
FRESHWATER ELEMENTARY	62828	HUMB - DEL NORTE	1200
GARFIELD ELEMENTARY	62836	HUMB - DEL NORTE	1200
HYDESVILLE ELEMENTARY	62885	HUMB - DEL NORTE	1200
JACOBY CREEK ELEMENTARY	62893	HUMB - DEL NORTE	1200
KLAMATH-TRINITY JOINT UNIFIED	62901	HUMB - DEL NORTE	1200
KNEELAND ELEMENTARY	62919	HUMB - DEL NORTE	1200
LOLETA UNION ELEMENTARY	62927	HUMB - DEL NORTE	1200
MAPLE CREEK ELEMENTARY	62935	HUMB - DEL NORTE	1200
MATTOLE UNIFIED	75382	HUMB - DEL NORTE	1200
MCKINLEYVILLE UNION ELEMENTARY	62950	HUMB - DEL NORTE	1200
NORTHERN HUMBOLDT UNION HIGH	62687	HUMB - DEL NORTE	1200
ORICK ELEMENTARY	62968	HUMB - DEL NORTE	1200
PACIFIC UNION ELEMENTARY	62976	HUMB - DEL NORTE	1200
PENINSULA UNION ELEMENTARY	62984	HUMB - DEL NORTE	1200
RIO DELL ELEMENTARY	63008	HUMB - DEL NORTE	1200
ROHNERVILLE ELEMENTARY	63016	HUMB - DEL NORTE	1200
SCOTIA UNION ELEMENTARY	63024	HUMB - DEL NORTE	1200
SOUTH BAY UNION ELEMENTARY	63032	HUMB - DEL NORTE	1200
SOUTHERN HUMBOLDT JOINT UNIFIE	63040	HUMB - DEL NORTE	1200
TRINIDAD UNION ELEMENTARY	63057	HUMB - DEL NORTE	1200

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix A-3

Alignment of Districts with SELPAs
Source: California Department of Education

District Name	District Code	SELPA Name	SELPA Code
* IMPERIAL CO. OFFICE OF EDUCAT	10132	IMPERIAL COUNTY	1300
BRAWLEY ELEMENTARY	63073	IMPERIAL COUNTY	1300
BRAWLEY UNION HIGH	63081	IMPERIAL COUNTY	1300
CALEXICO UNIFIED	63099	IMPERIAL COUNTY	1300
CALIPATRIA UNIFIED	63107	IMPERIAL COUNTY	1300
CENTRAL UNION HIGH	63115	IMPERIAL COUNTY	1300
EL CENTRO ELEMENTARY	63123	IMPERIAL COUNTY	1300
HEBER ELEMENTARY	63131	IMPERIAL COUNTY	1300
HOLTVILLE UNIFIED	63149	IMPERIAL COUNTY	1300
IMPERIAL UNIFIED	63164	IMPERIAL COUNTY	1300
MAGNOLIA UNION ELEMENTARY	63172	IMPERIAL COUNTY	1300
MCCABE UNION ELEMENTARY	63180	IMPERIAL COUNTY	1300
MEADOWS UNION ELEMENTARY	63198	IMPERIAL COUNTY	1300
MULBERRY ELEMENTARY	63206	IMPERIAL COUNTY	1300
SAN PASQUAL VALLEY UNIFIED	63214	IMPERIAL COUNTY	1300
SEELEY UNION ELEMENTARY	63222	IMPERIAL COUNTY	1300
WESTMORLAND UNION ELEMENTARY	63230	IMPERIAL COUNTY	1300
*INYO CO. OFFICE OF EDUCATION	10140	INYO COUNTY	1400
BIG PINE UNIFIED	63248	INYO COUNTY	1400
BISHOP JOINT UNION HIGH	63263	INYO COUNTY	1400
BISHOP UNION ELEMENTARY	63255	INYO COUNTY	1400
DEATH VALLEY UNIFIED	63271	INYO COUNTY	1400
LONE PINE UNIFIED	63289	INYO COUNTY	1400
OWENS VALLEY UNIFIED	63297	INYO COUNTY	1400
ROUND VALLEY JOINT ELEMENTARY	63305	INYO COUNTY	1400
IRVINE UNIFIED	73650	IRVINE UNIFIED	3014
*KERN CO. OFFICE OF EDUCATION	10157	KERN COUNTY	1501
ARVIN UNION ELEMENTARY	63313	KERN COUNTY	1501
BEARDSLEY ELEMENTARY	63339	KERN COUNTY	1501
BELRIDGE ELEMENTARY	63347	KERN COUNTY	1501
BLAKE ELEMENTARY	63354	KERN COUNTY	1501
BUTTONWILLOW UNION ELEMENTARY	63370	KERN COUNTY	1501
CALIENTE UNION ELEMENTARY	63388	KERN COUNTY	1501
DELANO JOINT UNION HIGH	63412	KERN COUNTY	1501
DELANO UNION ELEMENTARY	63404	KERN COUNTY	1501
DI GIORGIO ELEMENTARY	63420	KERN COUNTY	1501
EDISON ELEMENTARY	63438	KERN COUNTY	1501
EL TEJON UNIFIED	75168	KERN COUNTY	1501
ELK HILLS ELEMENTARY	63446	KERN COUNTY	1501
FAIRFAX ELEMENTARY	63461	KERN COUNTY	1501
FRUITVALE ELEMENTARY	63479	KERN COUNTY	1501
GENERAL SHAFTER ELEMENTARY	63487	KERN COUNTY	1501
GREENFIELD UNION ELEMENTARY	63503	KERN COUNTY	1501
KERNVILLE UNION ELEMENTARY	63545	KERN COUNTY	1501
LAKES IDE UNION ELEMENTARY	63552	KERN COUNTY	1501
LAMONT ELEMENTARY	63560	KERN COUNTY	1501
LINNS VALLEY-POSO FLAT UNION	63586	KERN COUNTY	1501
LOST HILLS UNION ELEMENTARY	63594	KERN COUNTY	1501
MAPLE ELEMENTARY	63610	KERN COUNTY	1501
MARICOPA UNIFIED	63628	KERN COUNTY	1501
MCFARLAND UNIFIED	73908	KERN COUNTY	1501
MCKITTRICK ELEMENTARY	63651	KERN COUNTY	1501

Appendix A-3

Alignment of Districts with SELPAs
Source: California Department of Education

District Name	District Code	SELPA Name	SELPA Code
MIDWAY ELEMENTARY	63669	KERN COUNTY	1501
MOJAVE UNIFIED	63677	KERN COUNTY	1501
MUROC JOINT UNIFIED	63685	KERN COUNTY	1501
NORRIS ELEMENTARY	63693	KERN COUNTY	1501
PANAMA BUENA VISTA UNION ELEME	63362	KERN COUNTY	1501
POND UNION ELEMENTARY	63719	KERN COUNTY	1501
RICHLAND-LERDO UNION ELEMENTAR	63578	KERN COUNTY	1501
RIO BRAVO-GREELEY UNION ELEMEN	73544	KERN COUNTY	1501
ROSEDALE UNION ELEMENTARY	63750	KERN COUNTY	1501
SEMITROPIC ELEMENTARY	63768	KERN COUNTY	1501
SIERRA SANDS UNIFIED	73742	KERN COUNTY	1501
SOUTH FORK UNION ELEMENTARY	63784	KERN COUNTY	1501
SOUTHERN KERN UNIFIED	63776	KERN COUNTY	1501
STANDARD ELEMENTARY	63792	KERN COUNTY	1501
TAFT CITY ELEMENTARY	63800	KERN COUNTY	1501
TAFT UNION HIGH	63818	KERN COUNTY	1501
TEHACHAPI UNIFIED	63826	KERN COUNTY	1501
VINELAND ELEMENTARY	63834	KERN COUNTY	1501
WASCO UNION ELEMENTARY	63842	KERN COUNTY	1501
WASCO UNION HIGH	63859	KERN COUNTY	1501
KERN UNION HIGH	63529	KERN UNION HIGH	1512
*KINGS CO. OFFICE OF EDUCATION	10165	KINGS COUNTY	1600
ARMONA UNION ELEMENTARY	63875	KINGS COUNTY	1600
CENTRAL UNION ELEMENTARY	63883	KINGS COUNTY	1600
CORCORAN JOINT UNIFIED	63891	KINGS COUNTY	1600
DELTA VIEW JOINT UNION ELEMENT	63909	KINGS COUNTY	1600
HANFORD ELEMENTARY	63917	KINGS COUNTY	1600
HANFORD JOINT UNION HIGH	63925	KINGS COUNTY	1600
ISLAND UNION ELEMENTARY	63933	KINGS COUNTY	1600
KINGS RIVER-HARDWICK UNION ELE	63941	KINGS COUNTY	1600
KIT CARSON UNION ELEMENTARY	63958	KINGS COUNTY	1600
LAKES IDE UNION ELEMENTARY	63966	KINGS COUNTY	1600
LEMOORE UNION ELEMENTARY	63974	KINGS COUNTY	1600
LEMOORE UNION HIGH	63982	KINGS COUNTY	1600
PIONEER UNION ELEMENTARY	63990	KINGS COUNTY	1600
REEF-SUNSET UNIFIED	73932	KINGS COUNTY	1600
*LAKE CO. OFFICE OF EDUCATION	10173	LAKE COUNTY	1700
KELSEYVILLE UNIFIED	64014	LAKE COUNTY	1700
KONOCTI UNIFIED	64022	LAKE COUNTY	1700
LAKEPORT UNIFIED	64030	LAKE COUNTY	1700
LUCERNE ELEMENTARY	64048	LAKE COUNTY	1700
MIDDLETOWN UNIFIED	64055	LAKE COUNTY	1700
UPPER LAKE UNION ELEMENTARY	64063	LAKE COUNTY	1700
UPPER LAKE UNION HIGH	64071	LAKE COUNTY	1700
*LASSEN CO. OFFICE OF EDUCATIO	10181	LASSEN COUNTY	1800
BIG VALLEY JOINT UNIFIED	64089	LASSEN COUNTY	1800
FORT SAGE UNIFIED	75036	LASSEN COUNTY	1800
JANESVILLE UNION ELEMENTARY	64105	LASSEN COUNTY	1800
JOHNSTONVILLE ELEMENTARY	64113	LASSEN COUNTY	1800
LASSEN UNION HIGH	64139	LASSEN COUNTY	1800
RAVENDALE-TERMO ELEMENTARY	64162	LASSEN COUNTY	1800
RICHMOND ELEMENTARY	64170	LASSEN COUNTY	1800

Appendix A-3

Alignment of Districts with SELPAs
Source: California Department of Education

District Name	District Code	SELPA Name	SELPA Code
SHAFFER UNION ELEMENTARY	64188	LASSEN COUNTY	1800
SUSANVILLE ELEMENTARY	64196	LASSEN COUNTY	1800
WESTWOOD UNIFIED	64204	LASSEN COUNTY	1800
LOS ANGELES UNIFIED	64733	LAUSD	1914
LODI UNIFIED	68585	LODI	3911
NEW HOPE ELEMENTARY	68619	LODI	3911
OAK VIEW UNION ELEMENTARY	68635	LODI	3911
LONG BEACH UNIFIED	64725	LONG BEACH	1913
*MADERA CO. OFFICE OF EDUCATIO	10207	MADERA-MARIPOSA	2000
*MARIPOSA CO. OFFICE OF EDUCAT	10223	MADERA-MARIPOSA	2000
ALVIEW-DAIRYLAND UNION ELEMENT	65177	MADERA-MARIPOSA	2000
BASS LAKE ELEMENTARY	65185	MADERA-MARIPOSA	2000
CHAWANAKEE JT. ELEMENTARY	75135	MADERA-MARIPOSA	2000
CHOWCHILLA ELEMENTARY	65193	MADERA-MARIPOSA	2000
CHOWCHILLA UNION HIGH	65201	MADERA-MARIPOSA	2000
COARSEGOLD UNION ELEMENTARY	65219	MADERA-MARIPOSA	2000
MADERA UNIFIED	65243	MADERA-MARIPOSA	2000
MARIPOSA COUNTY UNIFIED	65532	MADERA-MARIPOSA	2000
MINARETS JT. UNION HIGH	75424	MADERA-MARIPOSA	2000
RAYMOND-KNOWLES UNION ELEMENTA	65276	MADERA-MARIPOSA	2000
YOSEMITE UNION HIGH	73734	MADERA-MARIPOSA	2000
*MARIN CO. OFFICE OF EDUCATION	10215	MARIN	2100
BOLINAS-STINSON UNION ELEMENTA	65300	MARIN	2100
DIXIE ELEMENTARY	65318	MARIN	2100
KENTFIELD ELEMENTARY	65334	MARIN	2100
LAGUNA JOINT ELEMENTARY	65342	MARIN	2100
LAGUNITAS ELEMENTARY	65359	MARIN	2100
LARKSPUR ELEMENTARY	65367	MARIN	2100
LINCOLN ELEMENTARY	65375	MARIN	2100
MILL VALLEY ELEMENTARY	65391	MARIN	2100
NICASIO ELEMENTARY	65409	MARIN	2100
NOVATO UNIFIED	65417	MARIN	2100
REED UNION ELEMENTARY	65425	MARIN	2100
ROSS VALLEY ELEMENTARY	75002	MARIN	2100
SAN RAFAEL CITY ELEMENTARY	65458	MARIN	2100
SAN RAFAEL CITY HIGH	65466	MARIN	2100
SAUSALITO ELEMENTARY	65474	MARIN	2100
SHORELINE UNIFIED	73361	MARIN	2100
TAMALPAIS UNION HIGH	65482	MARIN	2100
UNION JOINT ELEMENTARY	65516	MARIN	2100
*MENDOCINO CO. OFFICE OF EDUCA	10231	MENDOCINO	2300
ANDERSON VALLEY UNIFIED	65540	MENDOCINO	2300
ARENA UNION ELEMENTARY	65557	MENDOCINO	2300
FORT BRAGG UNIFIED	65565	MENDOCINO	2300
LAYTONVILLE UNIFIED	73916	MENDOCINO	2300
LEGGETT VALLEY UNIFIED	75218	MENDOCINO	2300
MANCHESTER UNION ELEMENTARY	65573	MENDOCINO	2300
MENDOCINO UNIFIED	65581	MENDOCINO	2300
POINT ARENA JOINT UNION HIGH	65599	MENDOCINO	2300
POTTER VALLEY COMMUNITY UN I FIE	73866	MENDOCINO	2300
ROUND VALLEY UNIFIED	65607	MENDOCINO	2300
UKIAH UNIFIED	65615	MENDOCINO	2300

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix A-3

Alignment of Districts with SELPAs
Source: California Department of Education

District Name	District Code	SELPA Name	SELPA Code
WILLITS UNIFIED	65623	MENDOCINO	2300
*MERCED CO. OFFICE OF EDUCATIO	10249	MERCED	2400
ATWATER ELEMENTARY	65631	MERCED	2400
BALLICO-CRESSEY ELEMENTARY	65649	MERCED	2400
DELHI UNIFIED	75366	MERCED	2400
DOS PALOS ORO LOMA JT. UNIFIED	75317	MERCED	2400
EL NIDO ELEMENTARY	65680	MERCED	2400
GUSTINE UNIFIED	73619	MERCED	2400
HILMAR UNIFIED	65698	MERCED	2400
LE GRAND UNION ELEMENTARY	65722	MERCED	2400
LE GRAND UNION HIGH	65730	MERCED	2400
LIVINGSTON UNION ELEMENTARY	65748	MERCED	2400
LOS BANOS UNIFIED	65755	MERCED	2400
MCSWAIN UNION ELEMENTARY	65763	MERCED	2400
MERGED CITY ELEMENTARY	65771	MERCED	2400
MERGED RIVER UNION ELEMENTARY	73726	MERCED	2400
MERGED UNION HIGH	65789	MERCED	2400
PLAINSBURG UNION ELEMENTARY	65813	MERCED	2400
PLANADA ELEMENTARY	65821	MERCED	2400
SNELLING-MERCED FALLS UNION EL	65839	MERCED	2400
WEAVER UNION ELEMENTARY	65862	MERCED	2400
WINTON ELEMENTARY	65870	MERCED	2400
BELLFLOWER UNIFIED	64303	MID CITIES	1904
COMPTON UNIFIED	73437	MID CITIES	1904
LYNWOOD UNIFIED	64774	MID CITIES	1904
PARAMOUNT UNIFIED	64873	MID CITIES	1904
CASTRO VALLEY UNIFIED	61150	MID COUNTY	111
HAYWARD UNIFIED	61192	MID COUNTY	111
SAN LEANDRO UNIFIED	61291	MID COUNTY	111
SAN LORENZO UNIFIED	61309	MID COUNTY	111
MODESTO CITY ELEMENTARY	71167	MODESTO	5011
MODESTO CITY HIGH	71175	MODESTO	5011
*MODOC CO. OFFICE OF EDUCATION	10256	MODOC	2500
MODOC JOINT UNIFIED	73585	MODOC	2500
SURPRISE VALLEY JOINT UNIFIED	65896	MODOC	2500
TULELAKE BASIN JOINT UNIFIED	73593	MODOC	2500
*MONO CO. OFFICE OF EDUCATION	10264	MONO	2600
EASTERN SIERRA UNIFIED	73668	MONO	2600
MAMMOTH UNIFIED	73692	MONO	2600
*MONTEREY CO. OFFICE OF EDUCAT	10272	MONTEREY	2700
ALISAL UNION ELEMENTARY	65961	MONTEREY	2700
BRADLEY UNION ELEMENTARY	65979	MONTEREY	2700
CARMEL UNIFIED	65987	MONTEREY	2700
CHUALAR UNION ELEMENTARY	65995	MONTEREY	2700
GONZALES UNION ELEMENTARY	66001	MONTEREY	2700
GONZALES UNION HIGH	66019	MONTEREY	2700
GRAVES ELEMENTARY	66027	MONTEREY	2700
GREENFIELD UNION ELEMENTARY	66035	MONTEREY	2700
KING CITY JOINT UNION HIGH	66068	MONTEREY	2700
KING CITY UNION ELEMENTARY	66050	MONTEREY	2700
LAGUNITA ELEMENTARY	66076	MONTEREY	2700
MISSION UNION ELEMENTARY	66084	MONTEREY	2700

Appendix A-3

Alignment of Districts with SELPAs
Source: California Department of Education

District Name	District Code	SELPA Name	SELPA Code
MONTEREY PENINSULA UNIFIED	66092	MONTEREY	2700
NORTH MONTEREY COUNTY UNIFIED	73825	MONTEREY	2700
PACIFIC GROVE UNIFIED	66134	MONTEREY	2700
PACIFIC UNIFIED	75150	MONTEREY	2700
SALINAS CITY ELEMENTARY	66142	MONTEREY	2700
SALINAS UNION HIGH	66159	MONTEREY	2700
SAN ANTONIO UNION ELEMENTARY	66167	MONTEREY	2700
SAN ARDO UNION ELEMENTARY	66175	MONTEREY	2700
SAN LUCAS UNION ELEMENTARY	66183	MONTEREY	2700
SANTA RITA UNION ELEMENTARY	66191	MONTEREY	2700
SOLEDAD UNIFIED	75440	MONTEREY	2700
SPRECKELS UNION ELEMENTARY	66225	MONTEREY	2700
WASHINGTON UNION ELEMENTARY	66233	MONTEREY	2700
MORENO VALLEY 'UNIFIED	67124	MORENO VALLEY	3313
MORONGO UNIFIED	67777	MORONGO	3611
MT. DIABLO UNIFIED	61754	MT. DIABLO	711
BREA-OLINDA UNIFIED	66449	N.E. ORANGE	3016
PLACENTIA-YORBA LINDA UNIFIED	66647	N.E. ORANGE	3016
*NAPA CO. OFFICE OF EDUCATION	10280	NAPA	2800
CALISTC GA JOINT UNIFIED	66241	NAPA	2800
HOWELL MOUNTAIN ELEMENTARY	66258	NAPA	2800
NAPA VALLEY UNIFIED	66266	NAPA	2800
POPE VALLEY UNION ELEMENTARY	66282	NAPA	2800
ST. HELENA UNIFIED	66290	NAPA	2800
NEWPORT-MESA UNIFIED	66597	NEWPORT-MESA	3015
*ORANGE CO. OFFICE OF EDUCATIO	10306	NO. ORANGE	3001
BUENA PARK ELEMENTARY	66456	NO. ORANGE	3001
FULLERTON ELEMENTARY	66506	NO. ORANGE	3001
FULLERTON JOINT UNION HIGH	66514	NO. ORANGE	3001
LA HABRA CITY ELEMENTARY	66563	NO. ORANGE	3001
LOWELL JOINT ELEMENTARY	64766	NO. ORANGE	3001
BONSALL UNION ELEMENTARY	67975	NORTH COASTAL	3702
CARDIFF ELEMENTARY	68007	NORTH COASTAL	3702
CARLSBAD UNIFIED	73551	NORTH COASTAL	3702
DEL MAR UNION ELEMENTARY	68056	NORTH COASTAL	3702
ENCINITAS UNION ELEMENTARY	68080	NORTH COASTAL	3702
FALLBROOK UNION ELEMENTARY	68114	NORTH COASTAL	3702
FALLBROOK UNION HIGH	68122	NORTH COASTAL	3702
OCEANSIDE CITY UNIFIED	73569	NORTH COASTAL	3702
RANCHO SANTA FE ELEMENTARY	68312	NORTH COASTAL	3702
SAN DIEGUITO UNION HIGH	68346	NORTH COASTAL	3702
SAN MARCOS UNIFIED	73791	NORTH COASTAL	3702
SOLANA BEACH ELEMENTARY	68387	NORTH COASTAL	3702
VALLECITOS ELEMENTARY	68437	NORTH COASTAL	3702
VISTA UNIFIED	68452	NORTH COASTAL	3702
BORREGO SPRINGS UNIFIED	67983	NORTH INLAND	3703
ESCONDIDO UNION ELEMENTARY	68098	NORTH INLAND	3703
ESCONDIDO UNION HIGH	68106	NORTH INLAND	3703
JULIAN UNION ELEMENTARY	68163	NORTH INLAND	3703
PAUMA ELEMENTARY	68288	NORTH INLAND	3703
RAMONA CITY UNIFIED	68304	NORTH INLAND	3703
SAN PASQUAL UNION ELEMENTARY	68353	NORTH INLAND	3703

Appendix A-3

Alignment of Districts with SELPAs
Source: California Department of Education

District Name	District Code	SELPA Name	SELPA Code
VALLEY CENTER UNION ELEMENTARY	68445	NORTH INLAND	3703
WARNER UNIFIED	75416	NORTH INLAND	3703
ALAMEDA CITY UNIFIED	61119	NORTH REGION	112
ALBANY CITY UNIFIED	61127	NORTH REGION	112
BERKELEY UNIFIED	61143	NORTH REGION	112
EMERY UNIFIED	61168	NORTH REGION	112
PIEDMONT CITY UNIFIED	61275	NORTH REGION	112
ABC UNIFIED	64212	NORWALK-LA MIRADA	1915
NORWALK-LA MIRADA UNIFIED	64840	NORWALK-LA MIRADA	1915
*ALAMEDA CO. OFFICE OF EDUCATI	10017	OAKLAND	113
OAKLAND UNIFIED	61259	OAKLAND	113
ORANGE UNIFIED	66621	ORANGE UNIFIED	3017
PAJARO VALLEY JOINT UNIFIED	69799	PAJARO	4411
PASADENA UNIFIED	64881	PASADENA	1916
*NEVADA CO. OFFICE OF EDUCATIO	10298	PLACER-NEVADA	3100
*PLACER CO. OFFICE OF EDUCATIO	10314	PLACER-NEVADA	3100
ACKERMAN ELEMENTARY	66761	PLACER-NEVADA	3100
ALTA-DUTCH FLAT UNION ELEMENTA	66779	PLACER-NEVADA	3100
AUBURN UNION ELEMENTARY	66787	PLACER-NEVADA	3100
CHICAGO PARK ELEMENTARY	66316	PLACER-NEVADA	3100
CLEAR CREEK ELEMENTARY	66324	PLACER-NEVADA	3100
COLFAX ELEMENTARY	66795	PLACER-NEVADA	3100
DRY CREEK JOINT ELEMENTARY	66803	PLACER-NEVADA	3100
EMIGRANT GAP ELEMENTARY	66811	PLACER-NEVADA	3100
EUREKA UNION ELEMENTARY	66829	PLACER-NEVADA	3100
FORESTHILL UNION ELEMENTARY	66837	PLACER-NEVADA	3100
GRASS VALLEY ELEMENTARY	66332	PLACER-NEVADA	3100
LOOMIS UNION ELEMENTARY	66845	PLACER-NEVADA	3100
NEVADA CITY ELEMENTARY	66340	PLACER-NEVADA	3100
NEVADA JOINT UNION HIGH	66357	PLACER-NEVADA	3100
NEWCASTLE ELEMENTARY	66852	PLACER-NEVADA	3100
OPHIR ELEMENTARY	66860	PLACER-NEVADA	3100
PENRYN ELEMENTARY	66878	PLACER-NEVADA	3100
PLACER HILLS UNION ELEMENTARY	66886	PLACER-NEVADA	3100
PLACER UNION HIGH	66894	PLACER-NEVADA	3100
PLEASANT RIDGE UNION ELEMENTAR	66373	PLACER-NEVADA	3100
PLEASANT VALLEY ELEMENTARY	66381	PLACER-NEVADA	3100
READY SPRINGS UNION ELEMENTARY	66399	PLACER-NEVADA	3100
ROCKLIN UNIFIED	75085	PLACER-NEVADA	3100
ROSEVILLE CITY ELEMENTARY	66910	PLACER-NEVADA	3100
ROSEVILLE JOINT UNION HIGH	66928	PLACER-NEVADA	3100
TAHOE-TRUCKEE UNIFIED	66944	PLACER-NEVADA	3100
TWIN RIDGES ELEMENTARY	66415	PLACER-NEVADA	3100
UNION HILL ELEMENTARY	66407	PLACER-NEVADA	3100
WESTERN PLACER UNIFIED	66951	PLACER-NEVADA	3100
PLUMAS UNIFIED	66969	PLUMAS UNIFIED	3200
POWAY UNIFIED	68296	POWAY UNIFIED	3711
HACIENDA LA PUENTE UNIFIED	73445	PUENTE HILLS	1905
ROWLAND UNIFIED	73452	PUENTE HILLS	1905
*RIVERSIDE CO. OFFICE OF EDUCA	10330	RIVERSIDE COUNTY	3301
ALVORD UNIFIED	66977	RIVERSIDE COUNTY	3301
BANNING UNIFIED	66985	RIVERSIDE COUNTY	3301

Appendix A-3

Alignment of Districts with SELPAs
Source: California Department of Education

District Name	District Code	SELPA Name	SELPA Code
BEAUMONT UNIFIED	66993	RIVERSIDE COUNTY	3301
COACHELLA VALLEY UNIFIED	73676	RIVERSIDE COUNTY	3301
DESERT CENTER UNIFIED	67041	RIVERSIDE COUNTY	3301
DESERT SANDS UNIFIED	67058	RIVERSIDE COUNTY	3301
HEMET UNIFIED	67082	RIVERSIDE COUNTY	3301
JURUPA UNIFIED	67090	RIVERSIDE COUNTY	3301
LAKE ELSINORE UNIFIED	75176	RIVERSIDE COUNTY	3301
MENIFEE UNION ELEMENTARY	67116	RIVERSIDE COUNTY	3301
MURRIETA VALLEY UNIFIED	75200	RIVERSIDE COUNTY	3301
NUVIEW UNION ELEMENTARY	67157	RIVERSIDE COUNTY	3301
PALM SPRINGS UNIFIED	67173	RIVERSIDE COUNTY	3301
PALO VERDE UNIFIED	67181	RIVERSIDE COUNTY	3301
PERRIS ELEMENTARY	67199	RIVERSIDE COUNTY	3301
PERRIS UNION HIGH	67207	RIVERSIDE COUNTY	3301
ROMOLAND ELEMENTARY	67231	RIVERSIDE COUNTY	3301
SAN JACINTO UNIFIED	67249	RIVERSIDE COUNTY	3301
TEMECULA VALLEY UNIFIED	75192	RIVERSIDE COUNTY	3301
VAL VERDE UNIFIED	75242	RIVERSIDE COUNTY	3301
RIVERSIDE UNIFIED	67215	RIVERSIDE UNIFIED	3312
SACRAMENTO CITY UNIFIED	67439	SACRAMENTO CITY	3412
* SACRAMENTO CO. OFFICE OF EDUC	10348	SACRAMENTO COUNTY	3401
ARCOHE UNION ELEMENTARY	67280	SACRAMENTO COUNTY	3401
CENTER JOINT UNIFIED	73973	SACRAMENTO COUNTY	3401
DEL PASO HEIGHTS ELEMENTARY	67306	SACRAMENTO COUNTY	3401
ELVERTA JOINT ELEMENTARY	67322	SACRAMENTO COUNTY	3401
FOLSOM-CORDOVA UNIFIED	67330	SACRAMENTO COUNTY	3401
GALT JOINT UNION ELEMENTARY	67348	SACRAMENTO COUNTY	3401
GALT JOINT UNION HIGH	67355	SACRAMENTO COUNTY	3401
GRANT JOINT UNION HIGH	67363	SACRAMENTO COUNTY	3401
NATOMAS UNIFIED	75283	SACRAMENTO COUNTY	3401
NORTH SACRAMENTO ELEMENTARY	67397	SACRAMENTO COUNTY	3401
RIO LINDA UNION ELEMENTARY	67405	SACRAMENTO COUNTY	3401
RIVER DELTA JOINT UNIFIED	67413	SACRAMENTO COUNTY	3401
ROBLA ELEMENTARY	67421	SACRAMENTO COUNTY	3401
*SAN BENITO CO. OFFICE OF EDCU	10355	SAN BENITO	3500
AROMAS/SAN JUAN UNIFIED	75259	SAN BENITO	3500
BITTERWATER-TULLY UNION ELEMEN	67454	SAN BENITO	3500
CIENEGA UNION ELEMENTARY	67462	SAN BENITO	3500
HOLLISTER ELEMENTARY	67470	SAN BENITO	3500
JEFFERSON ELEMENTARY	67488	SAN BENITO	3500
NORTH COUNTY JOINT UNION ELEME	67504	SAN BENITO	3500
PANOCHE ELEMENTARY	67520	SAN BENITO	3500
SAN BENITO HIGH	67538	SAN BENITO	3500
SOUTHS IDE ELEMENTARY	67553	SAN BENITO	3500
TRES PINOS UNION ELEMENTARY	67561	SAN BENITO	3500
WILLOW GROVE UNION ELEMENTARY	67579	SAN BENITO	3500
SAN BERNARDINO CITY UNIFIED	67876	SAN BERNARDINO CITY	3612
SAN DIEGO CITY UNIFIED	68338	SAN DIEGO CITY	3712
SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED	68478	SAN FRANCISCO	3800
*SAN JOAQUIN CO. OFF. OF EDUCA	10397	SAN JOAQUIN	3901
BANTA ELEMENTARY	68486	SAN JOAQUIN	3901
DELTA ISLAND UNION ELEMENTARY	73478	SAN JOAQUIN	3901

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix A-3

Alignment of Districts with SELPAs
Source: California Department of Education

District Name	District Code	SELPA Name	SELPA Code
ESCALON UNIFIED	68502	SAN JOAQUIN	3901
HOLT UNION ELEMENTARY	68536	SAN JOAQUIN	3901
JEFFERSON ELEMENTARY	68544	SAN JOAQUIN	3901
LAMMERSVILLE ELEMENTARY	68551	SAN JOAQUIN	3901
LINCOLN UNIFIED	68569	SAN JOAQUIN	3901
LINDEN UNIFIED	68577	SAN JOAQUIN	3901
MANTECA UNIFIED	68593	SAN JOAQUIN	3901
NEW JERUSALEM ELEMENTARY	68627	SAN JOAQUIN	3901
RIPON UNIFIED	68650	SAN JOAQUIN	3901
TRACY ELEMENTARY	68684	SAN JOAQUIN	3901
TRACY JOINT UNION HIGH	68692	SAN JOAQUIN	3901
SAN JUAN UNIFIED	67447	SAN JUAN UNIFIED	3413
*SAN LUIS OBISPQ CO. OFF. OF E	10405	SAN LUIS OBISPO	4000
ATASCADERO UNIFIED	68700	SAN LUIS OBISPO	4000
CAMBRIA UNION ELEMENTARY	68718	SAN LUIS OBISPO	4000
CAYUCOS ELEMENTARY	68726	SAN LUIS OBISPO	4000
COAST UNION HIGH	68734	SAN LUIS OBISPO	4000
LUCIA MAR UNIFIED	68759	SAN LUIS OBISPO	4000
PASO ROBLES JOINT UNION HIGH	68775	SAN LUIS OBISPO	4000
PASO ROBLES UNION ELEMENTARY	68767	SAN LUIS OBISPO	4000
PLEASANT VALLEY JOINT UNION EL	68791	SAN LUIS OBISPO	4000
SAN LUIS COASTAL UNIFIED	68809	SAN LUIS OBISPO	4000
SAN MIGUEL JOINT 'UNION ELEMENT	68825	SAN LUIS OBISPO	4000
SHANDON JOINT UNIFIED	68833	SAN LUIS OBISPO	4000
TEMPLETON UNIFIED	68841	SAN LUIS OBISPO	4000
*SAN MATEO CO. OFF. OF EDUCATI	10413	SAN MATEO	4100
BAYSHORE ELEMENTARY	68858	SAN MATEO	4100
BELMONT ELEMENTARY	68866	SAN MATEO	4100
BRISBANE ELEMENTARY	68874	SAN MATEO	4100
BURLINGAME ELEMENTARY	68882	SAN MATEO	4100
CABRILLO UNIFIED	68890	SAN MATEO	4100
HILLSBOROUGH CITY ELEMENTARY	68908	SAN MATEO	4100
JEFFERSON ELEMENTARY	68916	SAN MATEO	4100
JEFFERSON UNION HIGH	68924	SAN MATEO	4100
LA HONDA-PESCADERO UNIFIED	68940	SAN MATEO	4100
LAGUNA SALADA UNION ELEMENTARY	68932	SAN MATEO	4100
LAS LOMITAS ELEMENTARY	68957	SAN MATEO	4100
MENLO PARK CITY ELEMENTARY	68965	SAN MATEO	4100
MILLBRAE ELEMENTARY	68973	SAN MATEO	4100
PORTOLA VALLEY ELEMENTARY	68981	SAN MATEO	4100
RAVENSWOOD CITY ELEMENTARY	68999	SAN MATEO	4100
REDWOOD CITY ELEMENTARY	69005	SAN MATEO	4100
SAN BRUNO PARK ELEMENTARY	69013	SAN MATEO	4100
SAN CARLOS ELEMENTARY	69021	SAN MATEO	4100
SAN MATEO UNION HIGH	69047	SAN MATEO	4100
SAN MATEO-FOSTER CITY ELEMENTA	69039	SAN MATEO	4100
SEQUOIA UNION HIGH	69062	SAN MATEO	4100
SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED	69070	SAN MATEO	4100
WOODSIDE ELEMENTARY	69088	SAN MATEO	4100
SANTA ANA UNIFIED	66670	SANTA ANA	3018
*SANTA BARBARA CO. OFF. OF EDU	10421	SANTA BARBARA	4200
BALLARD ELEMENTARY	69104	SANTA BARBARA	4200

Appendix A-3

Alignment of Districts with SELPAs
Source: California Department of Education

District Name	District Code	SELPA Name	SELPA Code
BLOCHMAN UNION ELEMENTARY	69112	SANTA BARBARA	4200
BUELLTON UNION ELEMENTARY	69138	SANTA BARBARA	4200
CARPINTERIA UNIFIED	69146	SANTA BARBARA	4200
CASMALIA ELEMENTARY	69153	SANTA BARBARA	4200
COLD SPRING ELEMENTARY	69161	SANTA BARBARA	4200
COLLEGE ELEMENTARY	69179	SANTA BARBARA	4200
CUYAMA JOINT UNIFIED	75010	SANTA BARBARA	4200
GOLETA UNION ELEMENTARY	69195	SANTA BARBARA	4200
GUADALUPE UNION ELEMENTARY	69203	SANTA BARBARA	4200
HOPE ELEMENTARY	69211	SANTA BARBARA	4200
LOMPOC UNIFIED	69229	SANTA BARBARA	4200
LOS ALAMOS ELEMENTARY	69237	SANTA BARBARA	4200
LOS OLIVOS ELEMENTARY	69245	SANTA BARBARA	4200
MONTECITO UNION ELEMENTARY	69252	SANTA BARBARA	4200
ORCUTT UNION ELEMENTARY	69260	SANTA BARBARA	4200
SANTA BARBARA ELEMENTARY	69278	SANTA BARBARA	4200
SANTA BARBARA HIGH	69286	SANTA BARBARA	4200
SANTA MARIA JOINT UNION HIGH	69310	SANTA BARBARA	4200
SANTA MARIA-BONITA ELEMENTARY	69120	SANTA BARBARA	4200
SANTA YNEZ VALLEY UNION HIGH	69328	SANTA BARBARA	4200
SOLVANG ELEMENTARY	69336	SANTA BARBARA	4200
VISTA DEL MAR UNION ELEMENTARY	69344	SANTA BARBARA	4200
*SANTA CLARA CO. OFF. OF EDUCA	10439	SANTA CLARA AREA I	4301
LOS ALTOS ELEMENTARY	69518	SANTA CLARA AREA I	4301
MOUNTAIN VIEW ELEMENTARY	69591	SANTA CLARA AREA I	4301
MOUNTAIN VIEW-LOS ALTOS UNION	69609	SANTA CLARA AREA I	4301
PALO ALTO UNIFIED	69641	SANTA CLARA AREA I	4301
WHISMAN ELEMENTARY	69724	SANTA CLARA AREA I	4301
CUPERTINO UNION ELEMENTARY	69419	SANTA CLARA AREA II	4302
FREMONT UNION HIGH	69468	SANTA CLARA AREA II	4302
MONTEBELLO ELEMENTARY	69567	SANTA CLARA AREA II	4302
SUNNYVALE ELEMENTARY	69690	SANTA CLARA AREA II	4302
SAN JOSE UNIFIED	69666	SANTA CLARA AREA IV	4304
ALUM ROCK UNION ELEMENTARY	69369	SANTA CLARA AREA V	4305
BERRYESSA UNION ELEMENTARY	69377	SANTA CLARA AREA V	4305
EAST SIDE UNION HIGH	69427	SANTA CLARA AREA V	4305
EVERGREEN ELEMENTARY	69435	SANTA CLARA AREA V	4305
FRANKLIN-MCKINLEY ELEMENTARY	69450	SANTA CLARA AREA V	4305
MILPITAS UNIFIED	73387	SANTA CLARA AREA V	4305
MT. PLEASANT ELEMENTARY	69617	SANTA CLARA AREA V	4305
OAK GROVE ELEMENTARY	69625	SANTA CLARA AREA V	4305
ORCHARD ELEMENTARY	69633	SANTA CLARA AREA V	4305
GILROY UNIFIED	69484	SANTA CLARA AREA VI	4306
MORGAN HILL UNIFIED	69583	SANTA CLARA AREA VI	4306
SANTA CLARA UNIFIED	69674	SANTA CLARA AREA VII	4307
CAMBRIAN ELEMENTARY	69385	SANTA CLARA III	4303
CAMPBELL UNION ELEMENTARY	69393	SANTA CLARA III	4303
CAMPBELL UNION HIGH	69401	SANTA CLARA III	4303
LAKES IDE JOINT ELEMENTARY	69492	SANTA CLARA III	4303
LOMA PRIETA JOINT UNION ELEMEN	69500	SANTA CLARA III	4303
LOS GATOS UNION ELEMENTARY	69526	SANTA CLARA III	4303
LOS GATOS-SARATOGA JOINT UNION	69534	SANTA CLARA III	4303

Appendix A-3

Alignment of Districts with SELPAs
Source: California Department of Education

District Name	District Code	SELPA Name	SELPA Code
LUTHER BURBANK ELEMENTARY	69542	SANTA CLARA III	4303
MORELAND ELEMENTARY	69575	SANTA CLARA III	4303
SARATOGA UNION ELEMENTARY	69682	SANTA CLARA III	4303
UNION ELEMENTARY	69708	SANTA CLARA III	4303
CASTAIC UNION ELEMENTARY	64345	SANTA CLARITA	1906
NEWHALL ELEMENTARY	64832	SANTA CLARITA	1906
SAUGUS UNION ELEMENTARY	64998	SANTA CLARITA	1906
SULPHUR SPRINGS UNION ELEMENTA	65045	SANTA CLARITA	1906
WILLIAM S. HART UNION HIGH	65136	SANTA CLARITA	1906
*SANTA CRUZ CO. OFF. OF EDUCAT	10447	SANTA CRUZ	4401
BONNY DOON UNION ELEMENTARY	69732	SANTA CRUZ	4401
HAPPY VALLEY ELEMENTARY	69757	SANTA CRUZ	4401
LIVE OAK ELEMENTARY	69765	SANTA CRUZ	4401
MOUNTAIN ELEMENTARY	69773	SANTA CRUZ	4401
PACIFIC ELEMENTARY	69781	SANTA CRUZ	4401
SAN LORENZO VALLEY UNIFIED	69807	SANTA CRUZ	4401
SANTA CRUZ CITY ELEMENTARY	69815	SANTA CRUZ	4401
SANTA CRUZ CITY HIGH	69823	SANTA CRUZ	4401
SCOTTS VALLEY UNIFIED	75432	SANTA CRUZ	4401
SOQUEL ELEMENTARY	69849	SANTA CRUZ	4401
*SHASTA CO. OFFICE OF EDUCATIO	10454	SHASTA COUNTY	4500
ANDERSON UNION HIGH	69856	SHASTA COUNTY	4500
BELLA VISTA ELEMENTARY	69872	SHASTA COUNTY	4500
BLACK BUTTE UNION ELEMENTARY	69880	SHASTA COUNTY	4500
CASCADE UNION ELEMENTARY	69914	SHASTA COUNTY	4500
CASTLE ROCK UNION ELEMENTARY	69922	SHASTA COUNTY	4500
COLUMBIA ELEMENTARY	69948	SHASTA COUNTY	4500
COTTONWOOD UNION ELEMENTARY	69955	SHASTA COUNTY	4500
ENTERPRISE ELEMENTARY	69971	SHASTA COUNTY	4500
FALL RIVER JOINT UNIFIED	69989	SHASTA COUNTY	4500
FRENCH GULCH-WHISKEYTOWN ELEME	69997	SHASTA COUNTY	4500
GATEWAY UNIFIED	75267	SHASTA COUNTY	4500
GRANT ELEMENTARY	70003	SHASTA COUNTY	4500
HAPPY VALLEY UNION ELEMENTARY	70011	SHASTA COUNTY	4500
IGO, ONO, PLATINA UNION ELEMEN	70029	SHASTA COUNTY	4500
INDIAN SPRINGS ELEMENTARY	70037	SHASTA COUNTY	4500
JUNCTION ELEMENTARY	70045	SHASTA COUNTY	4500
MILLVILLE ELEMENTARY	70052	SHASTA COUNTY	4500
MOUNTAIN UNION ELEMENTARY	73700	SHASTA COUNTY	4500
NORTH COW CREEK ELEMENTARY	70078	SHASTA COUNTY	4500
OAK RUN ELEMENTARY	70086	SHASTA COUNTY	4500
PACHECO UNION ELEMENTARY	70094	SHASTA COUNTY	4500
REDDING ELEMENTARY	70110	SHASTA COUNTY	4500
SHASTA UNION ELEMENTARY	70128	SHASTA COUNTY	4500
SHASTA UNION HIGH	70136	SHASTA COUNTY	4500
WHITMORE UNION ELEMENTARY	70169	SHASTA COUNTY	4500
*SIERRA CO. OFFICE OF EDUCATIO	10462	SIERRA COUNTY	4600
SIERRA-PLUMAS JOINT UNIFIED	70177	SIERRA COUNTY	4600
*SISKIYOU CO. OFFICE OF EDUCAT	10470	SISKIYOU COUNTY	4700
BIG SPRINGS UNION ELEMENTARY	70185	SISKIYOU COUNTY	4700
BOGUS ELEMENTARY	70193	SISKIYOU COUNTY	4700
BUTTE VALLEY UNIFIED	73684	SISKIYOU COUNTY	4700

Appendix A-3

Alignment of Districts with SELPAs
Source: California Department of Education

District Name	District Code	SELPA Name	SELPA Code
BUTTEVILLE UNION ELEMENTARY	70201	SISKIYOU COUNTY	4700
DELPHIC ELEMENTARY	70227	SISKIYOU COUNTY	4700
DUNSMUIR ELEMENTARY	70243	SISKIYOU COUNTY	4700
DUNSMUIR JOINT UNION HIGH	70250	SISKIYOU COUNTY	4700
ETNA UNION ELEMENTARY	70268	SISKIYOU COUNTY	4700
ETNA UNION HIGH	70276	SISKIYOU COUNTY	4700
FORKS OF SALMON ELEMENTARY	70292	SISKIYOU COUNTY	4700
FORT JONES UNION ELEMENTARY	70300	SISKIYOU COUNTY	4700
GAZELLE UNION ELEMENTARY	70318	SISKIYOU COUNTY	4700
GRENADA ELEMENTARY	70326	SISKIYOU COUNTY	4700
HAPPY CAMP UNION ELEMENTARY	70334	SISKIYOU COUNTY	4700
HORNBROOK ELEMENTARY	70359	SISKIYOU COUNTY	4700
JUNCTION ELEMENTARY	70367	SISKIYOU COUNT '	4700
KLAMATH RIVER U-NION ELEMENTARY	70375	SISKIYOU COUNTY	4700
LITTLE SHASTA ELEMENTARY	70383	SISKIYOU COUNTY	4700
MCCLOUD UNION ELEMENTARY	70409	SISKIYOU COUNTY	4700
MONTAGUE ELEMENTARY	70417	SISKIYOU COUNTY	4700
MT. SHASTA UNION ELEMENTARY	70425	SISKIYOU COUNTY	4700
QUARTZ VALLEY ELEMENTARY	70433	SISKIYOU COUNTY	4700
SAWYERS BAR ELEMENTARY	70441	SISKIYOU COUNTY	4700
SEIAD ELEMENTARY	70458	SISKIYOU COUNTY	4700
SISKIYOU UNION HIGH	70466	SISKIYOU COUNTY	4700
WEED UNION ELEMENTARY	70482	SISKIYOU COUNTY	4700
WILLOW CREEK ELEMENTARY	70490	SISKIYOU COUNTY	4700
YREKA UNION ELEMENTARY	70508	SISKIYOU COUNTY	4700
YREKA UNION HIGH	70516	SISKIYOU COUNTY	4700
CAPISTRANO UNIFIED	66464	SO. ORANGE	3002
LAGUNA BEACH UNIFIED	66555	SO. ORANGE	3002
SADDLEBACK VALLEY UNIFIED	73635	SO. ORANGE	3002
*SOLANO CO. OFFICE OF EDUCATIO	10488	SOLANO COUNTY	4801
BENICIA UNIFIED	70524	SOLANO COUNTY	4801
DIXON UNIFIED	70532	SOLANO COUNTY	4801
FAIRFIELD-SUISUN UNIFIED	70540	SOLANO COUNTY	4801
TRAVIS UNIFIED	70565	SOLANO COUNTY	4801
VACAVILLE UNIFIED	70573	SOLANO COUNTY	4801
*SONOMA CO. OFFICE OF EDUCATIO	10496	SONOMA COUNTY	4900
ALEXANDER VALLEY UNION ELEMENT	70599	SONOMA COUNTY	4900
BELLEVUE UNION ELEMENTARY	70615	SONOMA COUNTY	4900
BENNETT VALLEY UNION ELEMENTAR	70623	SONOMA COUNTY	4900
CINNABAR ELEMENTARY	70649	SONOMA COUNTY	4900
CLOVERDALE UNIFIED	70656	SONOMA COUNTY	4900
COTATI-ROHNERT PARK UNIFIED	73882	SONOMA COUNTY	4900
DUNHAM ELEMENTARY	70672	SONOMA COUNTY	4900
FORESTVILLE UNION ELEMENTARY	70680	SONOMA COUNTY	4900
FORT ROSS ELEMENTARY	70698	SONOMA COUNTY	4900
GEYSERVILLE UNIFIED	70706	SONOMA COUNTY	4900
GRAVENSTEIN UNION ELEMENTARY	70714	SONOMA COUNTY	4900
GUERNEVILLE ELEMENTARY	70722	SONOMA COUNTY	4900
HARMONY UNION ELEMENTARY	70730	SONOMA COUNTY	4900
HEALDSBURG UNIFIED	75390	SONOMA COUNTY	4900
HORICON ELEMENTARY	70763	SONOMA COUNTY	4900
KASHIA ELEMENTARY	70888	SONOMA COUNTY	4900

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix A-3

Alignment of Districts with SELPAs
Source: California Department of Education

District Name	District Code	SELPA Name	SELPA Code
KENWOOD ELEMENTARY	70789	SONOMA COUNTY	4900
LIBERTY ELEMENTARY	70797	SONOMA COUNTY	4900
MARK WEST UNION ELEMENTARY	70805	SONOMA COUNTY	4900
MONTE RIO UNION ELEMENTARY	70813	SONOMA COUNTY	4900
MONTGOMERY ELEMENTARY	70821	SONOMA COUNTY	4900
OAK GROVE UNION ELEMENTARY	70839	SONOMA COUNTY	4900
OLD ADOBE UNION ELEMENTARY	70847	SONOMA COUNTY	4900
PETALUMA CITY ELEMENTARY	70854	SONOMA COUNTY	4900
PETALUMA JOINT UNION HIGH	70862	SONOMA COUNTY	4900
PINER-OLIVET UNION ELEMENTARY	70870	SONOMA COUNTY	4900
RINCON VALLEY UNION ELEMENTARY	70896	SONOMA COUNTY	4900
ROSELAND ELEMENTARY	70904	SONOMA COUNTY	4900
SANTA ROSA ELEMENTARY	70912	SONOMA COUNTY	4900
SANTA ROSA HIGH	70920	SONOMA COUNTY	4900
SEBASTOPOL UNION ELEMENTARY	70938	SONOMA COUNTY	4900
SONOMA VALLEY UNIFIED	70953	SONOMA COUNTY	4900
TWIN HILLS UNION ELEMENTARY	70961	SONOMA COUNTY	4900
TWO ROCK UNION ELEMENTARY	70979	SONOMA COUNTY	4900
WAUGH ELEMENTARY	70995	SONOMA COUNTY	4900
WEST SIDE UNION ELEMENTARY	71001	SONOMA COUNTY	4900
WEST SONOMA COUNTY UNION HIGH	70607	SONOMA COUNTY	4900
WILMAR UNION ELEMENTARY	71019	SONOMA COUNTY	4900
WINDSOR UNIFIED	75358	SONOMA COUNTY	4900
WRIGHT ELEMENTARY	71035	SONOMA COUNTY	4900
CHULA VISTA ELEMENTARY	68023	SOUTH BAY	3704
CORONADO UNIFIED	68031	SOUTH BAY	3704
NATIONAL ELEMENTARY	68221	SOUTH BAY	3704
SAN YSIDRO ELEMENTARY	68379	SOUTH BAY	3704
SOUTH BAY UNION ELEMENTARY	68395	SOUTH BAY	3704
SWEETWATER UNION HIGH	68411	SOUTH BAY	3704
CENTINELA VALLEY UNION HIGH	64352	SOUTHWEST	1907
EL SEGUNDO UNIFIED	64535	SOUTHWEST	1907
HAWTHORNE ELEMENTARY	64592	SOUTHWEST	1907
HERMOSA BEACH CITY ELEMENTARY	64600	SOUTHWEST	1907
INGLEWOOD UNIFIED	64634	SOUTHWEST	1907
LAWNDALE ELEMENTARY	64691	SOUTHWEST	1907
LENNOX ELEMENTARY	64709	SOUTHWEST	1907
MANHATTAN BEACH UNIFIED	75333	SOUTHWEST	1907
PALOS VERDES PENINSULA UNIFIED	64865	SOUTHWEST	1907
REDONDO BEACH UNIFIED	75341	SOUTHWEST	1907
TORRANCE UNIFIED	65060	SOUTHWEST	1907
WISEBURN ELEMENTARY	65169	SOUTHWEST	1907
^STANISLAUS CO. OFFICE OF EDUC	10504	STANISLAUS COUNTY	5001
BRITTAN ELEMENTARY	71357	STANISLAUS COUNTY	5001
BROWNS ELEMENTARY	71365	STANISLAUS COUNTY	5001
CERES UNIFIED	71043	STANISLAUS COUNTY	5001
CHATOM UNION ELEMENTARY	71050	STANISLAUS COUNTY	5001
EAST NICOLAUS JOINT UNION HIGH	71373	STANISLAUS COUNTY	5001
EMPIRE UNION ELEMENTARY	71076	STANISLAUS COUNTY	5001
FRANKLIN ELEMENTARY	71381	STANISLAUS COUNTY	5001
GRATTON ELEMENTARY	71084	STANISLAUS COUNTY	5001
HART-RANSOM UNION ELEMENTARY	71092	STANISLAUS COUNTY	5001

Appendix A-3

Alignment of Districts with SELPAs
Source: California Department of Education

District Name	District Code	SELPA Name	SELPA Code
HICKMAN ELEMENTARY	71100	STANISLAUS COUNTY	5001
HUGHSON UNION ELEMENTARY	71118	STANISLAUS COUNTY	5001
HUGHSON UNION HIGH	71126	STANISLAUS COUNTY	5001
KNIGHTS FERRY ELEMENTARY	71142	STANISLAUS COUNTY	5001
LA GRANGE ELEMENTARY	71159	STANISLAUS COUNTY	5001
MARCUM-ILLINOIS UNION ELEMENTA	71407	STANISLAUS COUNTY	5001
MERIDIAN ELEMENTARY	71415	STANISLAUS COUNTY	5001
NEWMAN-CROWS LANDING UNIFIED	73601	STANISLAUS COUNTY	5001
NUESTRO ELEMENTARY	71423	STANISLAUS COUNTY	5001
OAKDALE JOINT UNION HIGH	71191	STANISLAUS COUNTY	5001
OAKDALE UNION ELEMENTARY	71183	STANISLAUS COUNTY	5001
PATTERSON JOINT UNIFIED	71217	STANISLAUS COUNTY	5001
PLEASANT GROVE JOINT UNION ELE	71431	STANISLAUS COUNTY	5001
RIVERBANK ELEMENTARY	71225	STANISLAUS COUNTY	5001
ROBERTS FERRY UNION ELEMENTARY	71233	STANISLAUS COUNTY	5001
SALIDA UNION ELEMENTARY	71266	STANISLAUS COUNTY	5001
SHILOH ELEMENTARY	71274	STANISLAUS COUNTY	5001
STANISLAUS UNION ELEMENTARY	71282	STANISLAUS COUNTY	5001
SYLVAN UNION ELEMENTARY	71290	STANISLAUS COUNTY	5001
TURLOCK JOINT ELEMENTARY	71308	STANISLAUS COUNTY	5001
TURLOCK JOINT UNION HIGH	71316	STANISLAUS COUNTY	5001
WATERFORD ELEMENTARY	71332	STANISLAUS COUNTY	5001
WINSHIP ELEMENTARY	71456	STANISLAUS COUNTY	5001
STOCKTON CITY UNIFIED	68676	STOCKTON CITY	3912
*SUTTER CO. OFFICE OF EDUCATIO	10512	SUTTER COUNTY	5100
LIVE OAK UNIFIED	71399	SUTTER COUNTY	5100
SUTTER UNION HIGH	71449	SUTTER COUNTY	5100
YUBA CITY UNIFIED	71464	SUTTER COUNTY	5100
ALPINE COUNTY UNIFIED	61333	TAHOE-ALPINE	911
LAKE TAHOE UNIFIED	61903	TAHOE-ALPINE	911
*TEHAMA CO. OFFICE OF EDUCATIO	10520	TEHAMA COUNTY	5200
ANTELOPE ELEMENTARY	71472	TEHAMA COUNTY	5200
BEND ELEMENTARY	71480	TEHAMA COUNTY	5200
CORNING UNION ELEMENTARY	71498	TEHAMA COUNTY	5200
CORNING UNION HIGH	71506	TEHAMA COUNTY	5200
ELKINS ELEMENTARY	71514	TEHAMA COUNTY	5200
EVERGREEN UNION ELEMENTARY	71522	TEHAMA COUNTY	5200
FLOURNOY UNION ELEMENTARY	71530	TEHAMA COUNTY	5200
GERBER UNION ELEMENTARY	71548	TEHAMA COUNTY	5200
KIRKWOOD ELEMENTARY	71555	TEHAMA COUNTY	5200
LASSEN VIEW UNION ELEMENTARY	71563	TEHAMA COUNTY	5200
LOS MOLINOS UNIFIED	71571	TEHAMA COUNTY	5200
MANTON JOINT UNION ELEMENTARY	71589	TEHAMA COUNTY	5200
MINERAL ELEMENTARY	71605	TEHAMA COUNTY	5200
PLUM VALLEY ELEMENTARY	71613	TEHAMA COUNTY	5200
RED BLUFF JOINT UNION HIGH	71639	TEHAMA COUNTY	5200
RED BLUFF UNION ELEMENTARY	71621	TEHAMA COUNTY	5200
REEDS CREEK ELEMENTARY	71647	TEHAMA COUNTY	5200
RICHFIELD ELEMENTARY	71654	TEHAMA COUNTY	5200
BEVERLY HILLS UNIFIED	64311	TRI-CITIES	1917
CULVER CITY UNIFIED	64444	TRI-CITIES	1917
SANTA MONICA-MALIBU UNIFIED	64980	TRI-CITIES	1917

Appendix A-3

Alignment of Districts with SELPAs
Source: California Department of Education

District Name	District Code	SELPA Name	SELPA Code
*CALAVERAS CO. OFFICE OF EDUCA	10058	TRI-COUNTY	500
*TUOLUMNE CO. OFFICE OF EDUCAT	10553	TRI-COUNTY	500
AMADOR COUNTY UNIFIED	73981	TRI-COUNTY	500
BELLEVIEW ELEMENTARY	72306	TRI-COUNTY	500
BIG OAK FLAT-GROVELAND UNIFIED	75184	TRI-COUNTY	500
BRET HARTE UNION HIGH	61556	TRI-COUNTY	500
CALAVERAS UNIFIED	61564	TRI-COUNTY	500
CHINESE CAMP ELEMENTARY	72330	TRI-COUNTY	500
COLUMBIA UNION ELEMENTARY	72348	TRI-COUNTY	500
CURTIS CREEK ELEMENTARY	72355	TRI-COUNTY	500
JAMESTOWN ELEMENTARY	72363	TRI-COUNTY	500
MARK TWAIN UNION ELEMENTARY	61572	TRI-COUNTY	500
SONORA ELEMENTARY	72371	TRI-COUNTY	500
SONORA UNION HIGH	72389	TRI-COUNTY	500
SOULSBYVILLE ELEMENTARY	72397	TRI-COUNTY	500
SUMMERVILLE ELEMENTARY	72405	TRI-COUNTY	500
SUMMERVILLE UNION HIGH	72413	TRI-COUNTY	500
TWAIN HARTE-LONG BARN UNION EL	72421	TRI-COUNTY	500
VALLECITO UNION ELEMENTARY	61580	TRI-COUNTY	500
DUBLIN UNIFIED	75093	TRI-VALLEY	114
LIVERMORE VALLEY JOINT UNIFIED	61200	TRI-VALLEY	114
PLEASANTON UNIFIED	75101	TRI-VALLEY	114
SUNOL GLEN UNIFIED	75119	TRI-VALLEY	114
*TRINITY CO. OFFICE OF EDUCATI	10538	TRINITY COUNTY	5300
BURNT RANCH ELEMENTARY	71662	TRINITY COUNTY	5300
COFFEE CREEK ELEMENTARY	71670	TRINITY COUNTY	5300
COX BAR ELEMENTARY	71688	TRINITY COUNTY	5300
DOUGLAS CITY ELEMENTARY	71696	TRINITY COUNTY	5300
JUNCTION CITY ELEMENTARY	71738	TRINITY COUNTY	5300
LEWISTON ELEMENTARY	71746	TRINITY COUNTY	5300
MOUNTAIN VALLEY UNIFIED	75028	TRINITY COUNTY	5300
SOUTHERN TRINITY JOINT UNIFIED	73833	TRINITY COUNTY	5300
TRINITY CENTER ELEMENTARY	71761	TRINITY COUNTY	5300
TRINITY UNION HIGH	71779	TRINITY COUNTY	5300
WEAVERVILLE ELEMENTARY	71787	TRINITY COUNTY	5300
*TULARE CO. OFFICE OF EDUCATIO	10546	TULARE COUNTY	5400
ALLENSWORTH ELEMENTARY	71795	TULARE COUNTY	5400
ALPAUGH UNIFIED	71803	TULARE COUNTY	5400
ALTA VISTA ELEMENTARY	71811	TULARE COUNTY	5400
BUENA VISTA ELEMENTARY	71829	TULARE COUNTY	5400
BURTON ELEMENTARY	71837	TULARE COUNTY	5400
CITRUS SOUTH TULE ELEMENTARY	71845	TULARE COUNTY	5400
COLUMBINE ELEMENTARY	71852	TULARE COUNTY	5400
CUTLER-OROSI JOINT UNIFIED	71860	TULARE COUNTY	5400
DINUBA ELEMENTARY	71878	TULARE COUNTY	5400
DINUBA JOINT UNION HIGH	71886	TULARE COUNTY	5400
DUCOR UNION ELEMENTARY	71894	TULARE COUNTY	5400
EARLIMART ELEMENTARY	71902	TULARE COUNTY	5400
EXETER UNION ELEMENTARY	71910	TULARE COUNTY	5400
EXETER UNION HIGH	71928	TULARE COUNTY	5400
FARMERSVILLE UNIFIED	75325	TULARE COUNTY	5400
HOPE ELEMENTARY	71944	TULARE COUNTY	5400

District Name	District Code	SELPA Name	SELPA Code
HOT SPRINGS ELEMENTARY	71951	TULARE COUNTY	5400
KINGS RIVER UNION ELEMENTARY	71969	TULARE COUNTY	5400
LIBERTY ELEMENTARY	71985	TULARE COUNTY	5400
LINDSAY UNIFIED	71993	TULARE COUNTY	5400
MONSON-SULTANA JOINT UNION ELE	72009	TULARE COUNTY	5400
OAK VALLEY UNION ELEMENTARY	72017	TULARE COUNTY	5400
OUTSIDE CREEK ELEMENTARY	72025	TULARE COUNTY	5400
PALO VERDE UNION ELEMENTARY	72033	TULARE COUNTY	5400
PIXLEY UNION ELEMENTARY	72041	TULARE COUNTY	5400
PLEASANT VIEW ELEMENTARY	72058	TULARE COUNTY	5400
PORTERVILLE ELEMENTARY	72066	TULARE COUNTY	5400
PORTERVILLE UNION HIGH	72074	TULARE COUNTY	5400
RICHGROVE ELEMENTARY	72082	TULARE COUNTY	5400
ROCKFORD ELEMENTARY	72090	TULARE COUNTY	5400
SAUCELITO ELEMENTARY	72108	TULARE COUNTY	5400
SEQUOIA UNION ELEMENTARY	72116	TULARE COUNTY	5400
SPRINGVILLE UNION ELEMENTARY	72132	TULARE COUNTY	5400
STONE CORRAL ELEMENTARY	72140	TULARE COUNTY	5400
STRATHMORE UNION ELEMENTARY	72157	TULARE COUNTY	5400
STRATHMORE UNION HIGH	72165	TULARE COUNTY	5400
SUNDALE UNION ELEMENTARY	72173	TULARE COUNTY	5400
SUNNYSIDE UNION ELEMENTARY	72181	TULARE COUNTY	5400
TERRA BELLA UNION ELEMENTARY	72199	TULARE COUNTY	5400
THREE RIVERS UNION ELEMENTARY	72207	TULARE COUNTY	5400
TIPTON ELEMENTARY	72215	TULARE COUNTY	5400
TRAVER JOINT ELEMENTARY	72223	TULARE COUNTY	5400
TULARE CITY ELEMENTARY	72231	TULARE COUNTY	5400
TULARE JOINT UNION HIGH	72249	TULARE COUNTY	5400
VISALIA UNIFIED	72256	TULARE COUNTY	5400
WAUKENA JOINT UNION ELEMENTARY	72264	TULARE COUNTY	5400
WOODLAKE UNION ELEMENTARY	72272	TULARE COUNTY	5400
WOODLAKE UNION HIGH	72280	TULARE COUNTY	5400
WOODVILLE ELEMENTARY	72298	TULARE COUNTY	5400
TUSTIN UNIFIED	73643	TUSTIN UNIFIED	3019
VALLEJO CITY UNIFIED	70581	VALLEJO CITY	4811
*VENTURA CO. OFFICE OF EDUCATI	10561	VENTURA	5600
BRIGGS ELEMENTARY	72447	VENTURA	5600
CONEJO VALLEY UNIFIED	73759	VENTURA	5600
FILLMORE UNIFIED	72454	VENTURA	5600
HUENEME ELEMENTARY	72462	VENTURA	5600
LAS VIRGENES UNIFIED	64683	VENTURA	5600
MESA UNION ELEMENTARY	72470	VENTURA	5600
MOORPARK UNIFIED	73940	VENTURA	5600
MUPU ELEMENTARY	72504	VENTURA	5600
OAK PARK UNIFIED	73874	VENTURA	5600
OCEAN VIEW ELEMENTARY	72512	VENTURA	5600
OJAI UNIFIED	72520	VENTURA	5600
OXNARD ELEMENTARY	72538	VENTURA	5600
OXNARD UNION HIGH	72546	VENTURA	5600
PLEASANT VALLEY ELEMENTARY	72553	VENTURA	5600
RIO ELEMENTARY	72561	VENTURA	5600
SANTA CLARA ELEMENTARY	72579	VENTURA	5600

Appendix A-3

Alignment of Districts with SELPAs
Source: California Department of Education

District Name	District Code	SELPA Name	SELPA Code
SANTA PAULA ELEMENTARY	72587	VENTURA	5600
SANTA PAULA UNION HIGH	72595	VENTURA	5600
SIMI VALLEY UNIFIED	72603	VENTURA	5600
SOMIS UNION ELEMENTARY	72611	VENTURA	5600
VENTURA UNIFIED	72652	VENTURA	5600
WEST CONTRA COSTA UNIFIED	61796	W. CONTRA COSTA	712
FOUNTAIN VALLEY ELEMENTARY	66498	W. ORANGE	3020
HUNTINGTON BEACH CITY ELEMENTA	66530	W. ORANGE	3020
HUNTINGTON BEACH UNION HIGH	66548	W. ORANGE	3020
OCEAN VIEW ELEMENTARY	66613	W. ORANGE	3020
WESTMINSTER ELEMENTARY	66746	W. ORANGE	3020
ALHAMBRA CITY ELEMENTARY	64220	W. SAN GABRIEL	1908
ALHAMBRA CITY HIGH	64238	W. SAN GABRIEL	1908
ARCADIA UNIFIED	64261	W. SAN GABRIEL	1908
DUARTE UNIFIED	64469	W. SAN GABRIEL	1908
EL MONTE CITY ELEMENTARY	64501	W. SAN GABRIEL	1908
EL MONTE UNION HIGH	64519	W. SAN GABRIEL	1908
GARVEY ELEMENTARY	64550	W. SAN GABRIEL	1908
MONROVIA UNIFIED	64790	W. SAN GABRIEL	1908
MOUNTAIN VIEW ELEMENTARY	64816	W. SAN GABRIEL	1908
ROSEMEAD ELEMENTARY	64931	W. SAN GABRIEL	1908
SAN GABRIEL UNIFIED	75291	W. SAN GABRIEL	1908
SAN MARINO UNIFIED	64964	W. SAN GABRIEL	1908
SOUTH PASADENA UNIFIED	65029	W. SAN GABRIEL	1908
TEMPLE CITY UNIFIED	65052	W. SAN GABRIEL	1908
VALLE LINDO ELEMENTARY	65078	W. SAN GABRIEL	1908
FREMONT UNIFIED	61176	WASH TOWNSHIP	115
MOUNTAIN HOUSE ELEMENTARY	61218	WASH TOWNSHIP	115
NEW HAVEN UNIFIED	61242	WASH TOWNSHIP	115
NEWARK UNIFIED	61234	WASH TOWNSHIP	115
ALTA LOMA ELEMENTARY	67595	WEST END	3603
CENTRAL ELEMENTARY	67645	WEST END	3603
CHAFFEY UNION HIGH	67652	WEST END	3603
CHINO UNIFIED	67678	WEST END	3603
CUCAMONGA ELEMENTARY	67694	WEST END	3603
ETIWANDA ELEMENTARY	67702	WEST END	3603
MOUNTAIN VIEW ELEMENTARY	67785	WEST END	3603
MT. BALDY JOINT ELEMENTARY	67793	WEST END	3603
ONTAR 10-MONT CLAIR ELEMENTARY	67819	WEST END	3603
UPLAND UNIFIED	75069	WEST END	3603
EAST WHITTIER CITY ELEMENTARY	64485	WHITTIER	1918
EL RANCHO UNIFIED	64527	WHITTIER	1918
LITTLE LAKE CITY ELEMENTARY	64717	WHITTIER	1918
LOS NIETOS ELEMENTARY	64758	WHITTIER	1918
SOUTH WHITTIER ELEMENTARY	65037	WHITTIER	1918
WHITTIER CITY ELEMENTARY	65110	WHITTIER	1918
WHITTIER UNION HIGH	65128	WHITTIER	1918
*YOLO CO. OFFICE OF EDUCATION	10579	YOLO COUNTY	5700
DAVIS JOINT UNIFIED	72678	YOLO COUNTY	5700
ESPARTO UNIFIED	72686	YOLO COUNTY	5700
WASHINGTON UNIFIED	72694	YOLO COUNTY	5700
WINTERS JOINT UNIFIED	72702	YOLO COUNTY	5700

Appendix A-3

Alignment of Districts with SELPAs
Source: California Department of Education

District Name	District Code	SELPA Name	SELPA Code
WOODLAND JOINT UNIFIED	72710	YOLO COUNTY	5700
*YUBA CO. OFFICE OF EDUCATION	10587	YUBA COUNTY	5800
CAMPTONVILLE ELEMENTARY	72728	YUBA COUNTY	5800
MARYSVILLE JOINT UNIFIED	72736	YUBA COUNTY	5800
PLUMAS ELEMENTARY	72744	YUBA COUNTY	5800
WHEATLAND ELEMENTARY	72751	YUBA COUNTY	5800
WHEATLAND UNION HIGH	72769	YUBA COUNTY	5800

Appendix A-4

Chapter 3 Technical Notes

Question: Are differences across SELPAs in incidence of severe disabilities greater than expected by chance variations alone?

Data sources: CASEMIS 4/97; CBEDS 1997

Variables: Derived proportion of students in each SELPA defined as having severe (medicatlly-defined -- low incidence category -- and/or high-cost disabilities).

Analysis: Adaptation of chi-square statistic for testing differences in proportions for *m* independent samples (i.e., 115 SELPAs independently produce a proportion of identifications from a base population) with *m -1* degrees of freedom, following

$$^2 = 1/PQ \left(\sum_{1=1}^{m} n_i (p_i - P)^2 \right) \qquad (1)$$

where

$$p_i = n_{i1}/n_i \qquad (2)$$

and

$$P = n_i p_i / n_{i.} \qquad (3)$$

and

$$Q = 1-P \qquad (4)$$

The proportion of *students of interest* (e.g., low incidence categories, or higher than average cost) in a given SELPA is represented by **p**; number of students is **n**. Proportion of *students of interest* for the state as a whole is **P**. There are **m** =115 SELPAs for which proportions are calculated. **Q** is the proportion of students in the state who are NOT of interest.

The chi-squared statistic in Equation (1) is influenced by the cumulative differences between proportions of *students of interest* in each SELPA (p) and in the state as a whole (P). In other words, the more individual SELPAs have proportions of students of interest that vary from the proportion for the state as a whole, the larger becomes the ^{2}. The larger the^2, the less likely that it occurs by chance variations alone.

Appendix A-5

Chapter 4 Technical Notes (Final Regression Models)

Analyses were conducted with SPSS Version 6.1 for Windows. See Chapter 7 for description and interpretation of measures/variables.

I. Predicting Percent of Higher Cost Students (Final Multiple Regression Model)

Equation Number 1 Dependent Variable: PRCTHIGH

Block Number 1. Method: Enter PRCTLOW, SCHLSIZE, PERROLL

Variable(s) Entered on Step Number
1. PERROLL
2. PRCTLOW
3. SCHLSIZE

Analysis of Variance

			Analysis of Variance		
Multiple R	.6613		DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square
R Square	.4373	Regression	3	.00094	.00031
Adjusted R Square	.4221	Residual	111	.00121	.00001
Standard Error	3.299E-03				

F = 28.761 Signif F = .000

Variables in the Equation

Variable	B	SE B	Beta	T	Sig T
PRCTLOW	1.642	.197	.605	8.346	.000
SCHLSIZE	2.92E-06	1.39E-06	.159	2.100	.038
PERROLL	1.21E-06	6.47E-07	.140	1.870	.064
(Constant)	-.004	.003	-1.172	.244	

Residuals Statistics

	Min	Max	Mean	Std Dev	N
*PRED	.0023	.0258	.0112	.0029	115
*ZPRED	-3.1180	5.0989	.0000	1.0000	115
*SEPRED	.0003	.0018	.0006	.0002	115
*ADJPRED	.0017	.0288	.0112	.0030	115
*RESID	-.0084	.0138	.0000	.0033	115
*ZRESID	-2.5426	4.1717	.0000	.9868	115
*SRESID	-2.7271	4.2621	-.0031	1.0150	115

**DRESID*	*-.0101*	*.0144*	*.0000*	*.0035*	*115*
*SDRESID	-2.8105	4.6394	.0004	1.0391	115
**MAHAL*	*.0601*	*32.3436*	*2.9739*	*4.4543*	*115*
**COOK D*	*.0000*	*.6795*	*.0165*	*.0709*	*115*
**LEVER*	*.0005*	*.2837*	*.0261*	*.0391*	*115*

Total Cases = 115

Key to Diagnostic Variables

Name	Interpretation
DRESID	Deleted (Press) Residual
ADJPRED	Adjusted (Press) Predicted Value
ZPRED	Standardized Predicted Value
ZRESID	Standardized Residual
MAHAL	Mahalanobis' Distance
COOK D	Cook's Distance

II. Predicting Percent of Low Incidence Category Students (Stepwise Regression)

Equation Number 1 Dependent Variable: PRCTLOW

Block Number 1. Method: Stepwise Criteria PIN .0500 POUT .1000
ADA97, ENROLL97, PRCTAFDC, PRCTLEP, PRCTMEAL, PRCTRISK, SCHLS96, TOTALMSA, RESIDMSC

Variable(s) Entered on Step Number 1. PRCTLEP

Analysis of Variance

			Analysis of Variance		
Multiple R	.1891		DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square
R Square	.0358	Regression	1	.00001	.00001
Adjusted R Square	.0271	Residual	111	.00027	.00000
Standard Error	1.555E-03				

F = 4.118 Signif F = .045

Variables in the Equation

Variable	B	SE B	Beta	T	Sig T
PRCTLEP	.002	.001	.189	2.029	.045
(Constant)	.004	2.72E-04	15.827	.000	

Variables not in the Equation

Variable	B	SE B	Beta	T	Sig T
ADA97	.105	.103	.913	1.082	.282
ENROLL97	.104	.102	.921	1.077	.284
PRCTAFDC	-.056	-.055	.902	-.573	.568
PRCTMEAL	-.083	-.062	.548	-.656	.514
PRCTRISK	-.183	-.117	.396	-1.236	.219
SCHLS96	.084	.084	.953	.882	.380
TOTALMSA	-.094	-.096	.995	-1.008	.316
RESIDMSC	.131	.127	.908	1.347	.181

Appendix A-6

Allocation of Teacher Aides to Special Day Class and Resource Specialist Programs

	J-50 edp	Description
Resource Specialist Programs (RSP)	507F	Units operated non-severely handicapped RSP Aide ave P-1 P-2.
Special Day Class (SDC)	574D	FTE Aides used at P-1 + P-2 for severely handicapped average.
RSP/SDC	572D	FTE Aides used at P-1 + P-2 for non-severely handicapped average.

Formulae

Resource Specialist Programs (RSP)	=	507F
Special Day Class (SDC)	=	574D + (572D-507F)

Appendix A-7

Special Day Class (SDC) Personnel and Aide Multipliers by Disability Class Size

Disability	Students[1]	Class Size[2]	Teacher FTEs	Aide/Class[3]	Aide FTEs
Mentally Retarded (MR)	31344	11	2849.45	1	2849.45
Hard of Hearing (HH)	3312	7	473.14	1	473.14
Deaf (DEAF)	3118	6	519.67	1	519.67
Speech/Language Impaired (SLI)	13903	11	1263.91	1	1263.91
Visually Impaired (VI)	2684	7	383.43	1	383.43
Seriously Emotionally Disturbed (SED)	9038	7	1291.14	1.5	1936.71
Orthopedically Impaired (OI)	9542		1363.14	1.25	1703.93
Other Health Impairment (OHI)	4376	11	397.82	1	397.82
Specific Learning Disability (SLD)	89590	12	7465.83	0.5	3732.92
Deaf-Blind (DB)	152	4	38.00	1	38.00
Multihandicapped (MH)	5582	6	930.33	1.5	1395.50
Autism (AUT)	5167	7	738.14	1.5	1107.21
Traumatic Brain Injury (TBI)	480	6	80.00	1.5	120.00

Specified Model	178288	CASEMIS	17794.02	Teacher FTE	15921.69 Aide FTE
			10.02	Student/Teacher Ratio	11.20 Student/Aide Ratio
Personnel/J-50 model	178288	CASEMIS	17787.67	Personnel File	15917 J-50 File
Avg. SDC Student/Teacher Ratio			10.02	Student/Teacher Ratio	11.20 Student/Aide Ratio

Example of Formulae of Disability Mentally Retarded (MR)

MR students	31344	students		2849.45	teacher	$ 119,677,091	teacher salary
class size	11	students/teacher	*	$ 42,000	salary	+ $ 34,193,455	aide salary
=	2849.45	FTE teachers	=	$ 119,677,091	teacher salary	= $153,870,545	salary
	2849.45	FTE teaches		2849.45	aides	$153,870,545	salary
*	1	aides/teacher	*	$ 12,000	salary	31344	students
=	2849.45	aides	=	$ 34,193,455	aide salary	= **$4,909.09**	**MR salary cost/student**

[1] April 97 CASEMIS

[2] Specified Model by Advisory Committee Members Gross, Owens, del Castillo, and Shrager — $ 3,818.18 MR teacher sal/student

[3] Ibid — $ 1,090.91 MR aide sal/student

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix A-8

Calculation of NPS/LCI Group C Deduction

A SELPA	B NPS Group C ADA (J-50 R701C)	C 15% Deduct (col B - 15%)	D NPS Deduct for 15%	E Net NPS Group C ADA
ANAHEIM ELEM	2	0.30	1	1
ANTELOPE VALLEY	0	0.00	0	0
BAKERSFIELD	0	0.00	0	0
BUTTE COUNTY	9	1.35	2	7
CLOVIS UNIFIED	0	0.00	0	0
COLUSA COUNTY	0	0.00	0	0
CONTRA COSTA	21	3.15	4	17
CORONA-NORCO	41	6.15	7	34
DESERT MOUNTAIN	5	0.75	1	4
DOWNEY-MONTBELLO	3	0.45	1	2
E. SAN GABRIEL	256	38.40	39	217
EAST COUNTY	97	14.55	15	82
EAST VALLEY	125	18.75	19	106
EL DORADO	28	4.20	5	23
ELK GROVE	91	13.65	14	77
FONTANA UNIFIED	5	0.75	1	4
FOOTHILL	17	2.55	3	14
FRESNO COUNTY	0	0.00	0	0
FRESNO UNIFIED	0	0.00	0	0
GARDEN GROVE	2	0.30	1	1
GLENN COUNTY	0	0.00	0	0
GREATER ANAHEIM	2	0.30	1	1
HUMB - DEL NORTE	0	0.00	0	0
IMPERIAL COUNTY	0	0.00	0	0
INYO COUNTY	0	0.00	0	0
IRVINE UNIFIED	0	0.00	0	0
KERN COUNTY	0	0.00	0	0
KERN UNION HIGH	0	0.00	0	0
KINGS COUNTY	0	0.00	0	0
LAKE COUNTY	0	0.00	0	0
LASSEN COUNTY	0	0.00	0	0
LAUSD	745	111.75	112	633
LODI	15	2.25	3	12
LONG BEACH	109	16.35	17	92
MADERA-MARIPOSA	0	0.00	0	0
MARIN	150	22.50	23	127
MENDOCINO	100	15.00	15	85
MERCED	0	0.00	0	0
MID CITIES	38	5.70	6	32
MID COUNTY	63	9.45	10	53
MODESTO	12	1.80	2	10
MODOC	0	0.00	0	0
MONO	0	0.00	0	0
MONTEREY	0	0.00	0	0

A SELPA	B NPS Group C ADA (J-50 R701C)	C 15% Deduct (col B - 15%)	D NPS Deduct for 15%	E Net NPS Group C ADA
MORENO VALLEY	26	3.90	4	22
MORONGO	3	0.45	1	2
MT. DIABLO	7	1.05	2	5
N.E. ORANGE	0	0.00	0	0
NAPA	53	7.95	8	45
NEWPORT-MESA	5	0.75	1	4
NO. ORANGE	60	9.00	9	51
NORTH COASTAL	29	4.35	5	24
NORTH INLAND	39	5.85	6	33
NORTH REGION	8	1.20	2	6
NORWALK-LA MIRADA	2	0.30	1	1
OAKLAND	105	15.75	16	89
ORANGE UNIFIED	14	2.10	3	11
PAJARO	0	0.00	0	0
PASADENA	201	30.15	31	170
PLACER-NEVADA	55	8.25	9	46
PLUMAS UNIFIED	0	0.00	0	0
POWAY UNIFIED	0	0.00	0	0
PUENTE HILLS	0	0.00	0	0
RIVERSIDE COUNTY	229	34.35	35	194
RIVERSIDE UNIFIED	53	7.95	8	45
SACRAMENTO CITY	39	5.85	6	33
SACRAMENTO COUNTY	65	9.75	10	55
SAN BENITO	18	2.70	3	15
SAN BERNARDINO CITY	39	5.85	6	33
SAN DIEGO CITY	27	4.05	5	22
SAN FRANCISCO	48	7.20	8	40
SAN JOAQUIN	28	4.20	5	23
SAN JUAN UNIFIED	214	32.10	33	181
SAN LUIS OBISPO	0	0.00	0	0
SAN MATEO	4	0.60	1	3
SANTA ANA	4	0.60	1	3
SANTA BARBARA	122	18.30	19	103
SANTA CLARA AREA I	75	11.25	12	63
SANTA CLARA AREA II	0	0.00	0	0
SANTA CLARA AREA IV	0	0.00	0	0
SANTA CLARA AREA V	0	0.00	0	0
SANTA CLARA AREA VI	0	0.00	0	0
SANTA CLARA AREA VII	0	0.00	0	0
SANTA CLARA III	0	0.00	0	0
SANTA CLARITA	0	0.00	0	0
SANTA CRUZ	10	1.50	2	8
SHASTA COUNTY	66	9.90	10	56
SIERRA COUNTY	0	0.00	0	0
SISKIYOU COUNTY	0	0.00	0	0
SOLANO COUNTY	26	3.90	4	22
SONOMA COUNTY	191	28.65	29	162
SOUTH BAY	20	3.00	3	17
SO. ORANGE	0	0	0	0

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A SELPA	B NPS Group C ADA (J-50 R701C)	C 15% Deduct (col B - 15%)	D NPS Deduct for 15%	E Net NPS Group C ADA
SOUTHWEST	47	7.05	8	39
STANISLAUS COUNTY	75	11.25	12	63
STOCKTON CITY	94	14.10	15	79
SUTTER COUNTY	0	0.00	0	0
TAHOE-ALPINE	0	0.00	0	0
TEHAMA COUNTY	0	0.00	0	0
TRI-CITIES	8	1.20	2	6
TRI-COUNTY	18	2.70	3	15
TRINITY COUNTY	0	0.00	0	0
TRI-VALLEY	0	0.00	0	0
TULARE COUNTY	0	0.00	0	0
TUSTIN UNIFIED	2	0.30	1	1
VALLEJO CITY	17	2.55	3	14
VENTURA	92	13.80	14	78
W. CONTRA COSTA	55	8.25	9	46
W. ORANGE	0	0.00	0	0
W. SAN GABRIEL	50	7.50	8	42
WASH TOWNSHIP	18	2.70	3	15
WEST END	13	1.95	2	11
WHITTIER	15	2.25	3	12
YOLO COUNTY	26	3.90	4	22
YUBA COUNTY	0	0.00	0	0

Appendix A-9

Salary and Benefit Ratio for Classified and Certificated Personnel

	Salary	Benefit	Ratio	Formula
Classified	$ 12,000	20% + $5000	1.6167	(1 + b) * FTE Classified
				b = (5000/12000) + 20%

	Salary + Benefit*
Certificated	$ 50,400

*Source: Legislative Analysts Office

Appendix A-10

Nonpersonnel Multiplier

Nonpersonnel Multiplier = 1.0205 = 1 + n

n = 0.0205

$$\mathbf{n} = \frac{\text{nonpersonnel expenditure}}{\text{certificated + noncertificated expenditures}}$$

$$= \frac{4.2}{(174.2 + 30.6)}$$

= 0.0205

	Amount in Millions*	Ratio = (4.2/(174.2+30.6)) = 0.0205
Certificated Personnel	174.2	
Noncertificated Personnel	30.6	
Nonpersonnel	4.2	* 85-86 dollars

Chambers et al., *Impact on the Kentucky Education Reform Act on Special Education Costs and Funding*, Palo Alto, CSEF, 1995, p. 13.

Appendix A-11

Administrative Ratio

Administrative multiplier= 1.4447 = 1 + a

a = 0.4447

$$a = \frac{\text{adjusted base administration}}{\text{average SE cost/student}}$$

base = $ 1,872

avg. cost = $ 4,210.00

$$a = \frac{\$\ 1,872}{\$\ 4,210.00}$$

a = 0.4447

	Site 1	Site 2	Site 3	Site 4	Site 5	Site 6	Sum	Avg.
Sch. Adm.	806	634	427	1021	1029	773	4690	782
Pgr. Adm.	109	255	245	413	109	180	1311	219
DISt. Adm.	350	689	501	28	49	72	1689	282
Avg. Adm.								$ 1,282

Adm. Avg.	$ 1,282
CPI	1.46
Adm. Base	$ 1,872

Administrative: Parrish, *The Funding of Special Education Students in Public and Private Schools in* California, Stanford, 1987, p. 55.

Consumer Price Index: To derive CPI = 1.46, administrative costs using 1985/86 dollars were multiplied by the CPI over the period 1984-1996. Since CPI figures were not available for 1997, to compensate for the 1997 year the CPI was used from 1984 rather than 1985.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix A-12

Administrative Multiplier for NPS

Administrative ratio = $ 1.0339 = 1 + a

NPS a = 0.0339

NPS a = adjusted base administration / average NPS cost/student

NPS base = $ 730

NPS avg. cost = $21,514.00

NPS a = $ 730 / $21,514.00

NPS a = 0.0339

	Site 1	Site 2	Site 3	Site 4	Site 5	Site 6	Sum	Avg.
Pgr. Adm.	109	255	245	413	109	180	1311	218.50
DISt. Adm.	350	689	501	28	49	72	1689	281.50
Avg. Adm.								$ 500

Adm. Avg.	$	500
CPI		1.46
Adm. Base	$	730

Administrative: Parrish, *The Funding of Special Education Students in Public and Private Schools in* California, Stanford, 1987, p. 55.

Consumer Price Index: To derive CPI = 1.46, administrative costs using 1985/86 dollars were multiplied by the CPI over the period 1984-1996. Since CPI figures were not available for 1997, to compensate for the 1997 year the CPI was used from 1984 rather than 1985.

Appendix A-13

Formula for Determining Cost of Variable "5 or More DIS"

DIS	Instructional Cost + Admin	Students	total cost	total # students receiving DIS
50	*$ 1,334*	*248,811*	$331,913,874	*248,811*
51	*$ 11,519*	*2686*	$ 30,940,034	*2686*
52	*$ 1,367*	*47969*	$ 65,573,623	*47969*
53	*$ 735*	*5955*	$ 4,376,925	*5955*
54	*$ 1,334*	*25181*	$ 33,591,454	*25181*
55	$ 1,334	25181		
56	$ 1,334	25181		
57	*$ 1,837*	*6237*	$ 11,457,369	*6237*
58	*$ 1,096*	*1792*	$ 1,964,032	*1792*
59	*$ 5,099*	*1764*	$ 8,994,636	*1764*
60	$ 1,334	25181		
62	$ 1,334	25181		
63	*$ 1,616*	*12235*	$ 19,771,760	*12235*
64	$ 1,367	47969		
66	*$ 8,512*	*13816*	$117,601,792	*13816*
67	$ 8,512	13816		
68	$ 1,334	25181		
71	$ 8,512	13816		
72	$ 8,512	13816		
73	*$ 6,974*	*8575*	$ 59,802,050	*8575*
74	$ 6,974	8575		
75	$ 6,974	8575		
76	$ 6,974	8575		
77	$ 6,974	8575		
78	$ 6,974	8575		
79	$ 6,974	8575		
80	$ 6,974	8575		
83	$ 8,512	13816		
84	*$ 2,032*	*1318*	$ 2,678,176	*1318*
85	$ 2,032	1318		
86	$ 8,512	13816		
		680,636	$688,665,725	376,339
		avg. $/DIS	**$ 1,830**	

DIS in italics are to signal the first observation of a particular DIS within a subsection of DIS services grouped together, as explained in Appendix A-2. Subsequent DIS student observations within a particular subsection are not counted after the initial observation.

Appendix A-14

Formula for Calculating Cost of Special Day Class Placement with Mentally Retartded Example

1	Certificated Compensation/Student		$	4,582
2	SDC Classified MR Salary Cost		$	1,091
	Classified Benefit Ratio	*		1.6167
	Class. Compensation/Student		$	1,764
3	Sum Compensation/Student		$	6,346
4	Nonpersonnel multiplier	*		1.0205
	Instructional cost		$	6,476
5	Administrative multiplier	*		1.4447
	SDC total cost		**$**	**9,356**

SDC Salary Worksheet for MR

		2849.45	FTE teacher			2849.45	FTE aides
*	$	50,400	salary and benefit	*	$	12,000	salary
	$	143,612,280	teacher compensation		$	34,193,400	aide salary
		31344	students			31344	students
1	$	4,582	comp/student	2	$	1,091	salary/student

Appendix A-15

Formula for Calculating Cost of Resource Specialist Program Placement

1	Cert. Compensation/Student	$	2,122
2	RSP Classified Salary Cost	$	464.39
	Classified Benefit Ratio	*	1.6167
	Class. Compensation/Student	$	750.78
3	Sum Compensation/Student	$	2,873
4	Nonpersonnel multiplier	*	1.0205
	Instructional cost	$	2,931
5	Administrative multiplier	*	1.4447
	RSP total cost	$	4,235

RSP Salary Worksheet

		11512.62	FTE teacher			10583	FTE aides
*	$	50,400	salary and benefits	*	$	12,000	salary
	$	580,236,048	teacher compensation		$	126,996,000	aide salary
		273468	students			273468	students
	$	2,122	compensation/student		$	464	salary/student

Appendix A-16

Formula for Calculating Cost of Designated Instructional Services

1	Cert. Compensation/Student	$	905
2	DIS 50 Classified Salary Cost	$	-
	Classified Benefit Ratio	*	1.5267
	Class. Compensation/Student	$	-
3	Sum Compensation/Student	$	905
4	Nonpersonnel multiplier	*	1.0205
	Instructional cost	$	923
5	Administrative multiplier	*	1.4447
	DIS 50 Total Cost	$	1,334

DIS 50 Salary Worksheet

	4466.04	FTE teacher		0	FTE aides
$	50,400	salary and benefits	$	12,000	salary
$	225,088,416	teacher compensation	$	-	aide salary
	248811	students		248811	students
$	905	comp/student	$	-	salary/student

Appendix A-17

Formula for Determining Nonpublic School Cost per Student

Total NPS Expenditure from J-50 edp 703 columns a, b, & c.	$	266,140,550
NPS students		12370
Avg. NPS Instructional cost/student	$	21,515
Program and District Administration	*	1.0339
Avg. NPS cost/student with admin	$	22,244

Appendix A-18

SELPA Director's Interview Protocol

Good morning/afternoon, I'm……, with the American Institutes for Research which is conducting a study of severe, high cost special education students for the California Department of Education. I would like to ask you some questions regarding the characteristics of students who have been identified as having high cost combinations of placements and services. I would like to also ask you about your perceptions of what factors influence these placement and service decisions in your SELPA/district.

May I please have your permission to tape our conversation? I wish to capture the conversation to the greatest detail possible. The tapes will remain confidential and no information will be reported that will identify you or your SELPA/District by name. Do you have any questions? (I respondent refuses to be taped, indicate that you will take notes instead).

Characteristics:

1. You were sent a copy of a printout indicating the characteristics of the [i.e. top 25%] of the students receiving special education within your SELPA/District. I would like to review these with you. [Review the characteristics such as % in various disability categories, placements, most common services, etc.]

-Do you agree that these types of students are typically among the most costly to serve?

-If no, probe for areas of disagreement (e.g., different categories, different placements, service configurations, other).

- In your tenure as director, has the percentage as well as characteristics of high cost students been stable? Probe for changes in disability types such as SED as well as increases in out-of- district placement, use of paraprofessionals.

If there have been changes, to what do you attribute these changes? Probe for demographic changes, litigation, state or regional inclusion mandates, other.

- To what extent are high costs associated with age? For example, as a rule, are adolescents more costly than elementary age? What about gender? What about race/ethnicity?

Factors Contributing to Decisions

2. I would like to now ask you some questions regarding how the group of students came to have these high cost placements and services.

- [If there is a pattern among certain disability types, ask..] I notice that □.students are highly represented within the group of high cost students? Why do you think this is the case? Probe for: severity of need such as type of behaviors, multiple disabilities requiring extensive technology and thus monitoring, new approaches to intervention that require more intensive support from instructional assistants, (for residential placement) family inability to cope with student needs, lack of sufficient or adequate local school programs, lack of or insufficient community-based services such as mental health, etc., other.

- To what degree are decisions to place in separate classes/residential due to capacity issues in the local schools, such as lack of sufficient staff knowledge or experience?

Do you think that more of these students could probably be served in less costly environments or require fewer instructional assistants? If so, about what percentage of the group? What would make that possible?

-Do you feel that the decisions regarding type and amount of related services are generally based directly on student need?

To what degree do parent/family requests contribute to decisions to provide these related services?

To what degree do professional beliefs and training contribute to decisions to provide more of these related services? Probe for how often decisions are made to provide extensive hours of PT or OT based on a child□s poor eye-hand or gross motor coordination (such as frequently occurs with children with mental retardation) when such needs might be met by teachers and others given a basic treatment plan.

To what extent have decisions to provide certain services been the result of a new type of intervention, such as Lovass training, that require more intensive services? If this has been a factor, please describe the intervention and the particular types of students involved.

To what extent has litigation influenced placement and/or the nature or amount of services provided to students with disabilities? If influential, describe the litigation and types of students and services influenced. For example, has litigation around inclusion, such as the Rachel Holland decision created more inclusive classrooms which, in turn, has resulted in more instructional assistants assigned to children with severe disabilities.

School Capacity

3. I would like to end our interview with some questions regarding your perceptions about the trends among high cost students. Do you see the percentage of such students increasing in the future? If yes, probe for general reasons such as: needs of students and their families are more complex, more students coming to school with more severe behavior needs, survival of high risk and medically fragile children, other.
Probe for SELPA/district specific issues such as changing demographics, other.

- As a whole, can you think of ways that schools and school districts can maintain or reduce current costs? Probe for early prevention practices, better trained teachers, changes in local funding or building-level allocation policies, changes in service models (e.g., more/less inclusion, new roles for PT, OT), more family services such as parenting classes, etc., other.

- Overall, what is your perception of the new state funding formula? Do you think that it will affect actual costs of services or decisions regarding placement or services? If so, in what ways?

How would you like to see high cost students, such as those identified in your SELPA/district, funded?

Is there anything else you would like to tell me about high cost students?

Thank you for your time. We will send you a copy of the final report if you would like.

Appendix A-19

SELPA Directors Interviewed

Downy-Montebello
East San Gabriel
East Valley
Elk Grove
Garden Grove
Greater Anaheim
Irvine USD
Kern Union High
LAUSD
Modoc
North Orange County
Oakland
San Diego
San Francisco
South Orange County
Southwest
Whittier

(n=17)

Appendix A-20

Source of SELPA ADA Used in Analysis

SELPA ADA source is P1, J18/19, 1997-98, from the California Department of Education, Education Finance Division

Appendix A-21

Source of SELPA AB 602 Funding Rates Used in Analysis

SELPA AB 602 Funding Rates source is P1 J-50, 1997-98, from the California Department of Education, Education Finance Division

Appendix A-22

CASEMIS Exemptions

1. All students aged 0-2 were removed from CASEMIS for this analysis. Any student born after April 1, 1994 was not included in the analysis. 5130 students were removed from the analysis.
2. The LA County Court Schools (SELPA 1901) was not included in the analysis.
3. The state operated programs California State Special Schools (SELPA 7100), California Youth Authority (SELPA 7200), and California Dept. of Dev. Services (SELPA 7300) were not included in the analysis.